

805-
VOLUME XXVII

APR 23 1932
NUMBER 2

APRIL 1932

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

PAUL SHOREY, Managing Editor

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK

GORDON JENNINGS LAING
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

GERTRUDE SMITH
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, *University of Chicago*

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXVII

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1932

No. 2

Posidonius and Solar Eschatology	By Roger Miller Jones	113
Sparta and the Ionian Revolt: A Study of Spartan Foreign Policy and the Genesis of the Peloponnesian League	By Jakob A. O. Larsen	136
Line Omissions in Homeric Papyri since 1925	By Barbara P. McCarthy	151
Poisons and Poisoning among the Romans	By David B. Kaufman	156
Notes and Discussions		168

CLARENCE P. BILL: *Vergiliana*.—GEORGE HOWE: Note on *Veradius*.—KENNETH SCOTT: On *Apuleius Metamorphoses* II. 23.—C. J. FORBES: Octavius in the *Culex*.—A. D. FRASER: *Scheria—Cyprus*.—PAUL SHOREY: Note on *Porphyrus Vita Pythagorae*, § 58.

Book Reviews

HENRY GEORGE LIDDELL and ROBERT SCOTT (COMPS): *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Shorey).—ETIENNE PAUL: *Histoire romaine* (Larsen).—ANDRÉ FIGANIOL: *La conquête romaine* (Larsen).—PAUL MAXON (tr.): *Hésiode, Théogonie, Les Travaux et les Jours, Le Boucher* (Shorey).—GILBERT NORWOOD: *Greek Comedy* (Shorey).—GORDON J. LAING: *Survivals of Roman Religion* (McDaniel).—GRANT SHOWERMAN: *Rome and the Romans: A Survey and Interpretation* (McDaniel).—ADGUSTUS TABER MURRAY (tr.): *Four Plays by Euripides: "Alceste," "Medea," "Hippolytus," "Iphigenia among the Taurians"* (Lange).—MOSES HADAS: *Sextus Pompey* (Sage).—ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL: *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel. A Study of Its Aramaicisms in the Light of Hellenistic Greek* (Costas).—JOHN M. S. McDONALD: *Character-Portraits in Epicharmus, Sophron and Plato* (Shorey).—PAUL JORDAN-SMITH: *Robert Burton's "Philosophaster," with an English Translation of the Same, Together with His Other Minor Writings in Prose and Verse* (Shorey).—A. E. GRIFFIN: *Aristotle's Psychology of Conduct* (Shorey).—R. CANTARELLA: *Elementi primitivi della poesia Evidica* (Shorey).—HETTY GOLDMAN: *Excavations at Eutresis in Boeotia, Conducted by the Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University in Cooperation with the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Greece* (Johnson).—DAVID M. ROBINSON: *Excavations at Olynthus, Part II: Architecture and Sculpture: Houses and Other Buildings* (Johnson).—DAVID M. ROBINSON and CORNELIA G. HARCUI: *A Catalogue of the Greek Vases in the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology, Toronto* (Johnson).—DR. HERMANN THROM: *Die Thesis, Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte* (Shorey).—LOUIS E. LOD: *A Translation of the "Orphus" of Angelo Politian and the "Aminta" of Torquato Tasso, with an Introductory Essay on the Pastoral* (Nollin).—O. J. TODD: *Index Aristophaneus* (Shorey).—LANE COOPER (tr.): *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* (Shorey).—CATHARINE SAUNDERS: *Vergil's Primitive Italy* (De Witt).—ROBERT SETMOUR CONWAY: *Makers of Europe, Being the James Henry Morgan Lectures in Dickinson College for 1930* (De Witt).—GÖSTA THORRELL: *Posteralbreve Akhet* (Peterson).—GERHARD WIMAN: *Textkritische Studien till Arnobius* (Peterson).—EDWIN LEE JOHNSON: *Latin Words of Common English* (Shorey).—T. W. ALLEN: *The Homeric Scholia* (G. M. B.).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hayti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa Islands, Balearic Islands, Spain, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.31). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

For Japan: THE MARUEN COMPANY, LTD., Tokyo.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., Paoshan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.25, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill. Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1915. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

N

comin
ly

o. 2

113

136

151

156

168

177

y of
near:
age
blis
les,
nda,
and
ries
are
fit.

ese,
om.
les,
ato,
ub-
ock

as-
nd

12.
on

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXVII

APRIL 1932

Number 2

POSIDONIUS AND SOLAR ESCHATOLOGY

BY ROGER MILLER JONES

AT THE end of his earlier work, *Poseidonios*, Karl Reinhardt dismissed very briefly the question of the eschatology of this philosopher, rejecting the results of previous investigators and admitting traces of his influence only in Cicero *Tuscul. disput.* i. 43, and perhaps in Sextus Empiricus *Adv. math.* ix. 71-74. While he thought it likely that Posidonius found a place for souls in the region of the moon, all details of his theory of life after death Reinhardt regarded as utterly unknown. But in *Kosmos und Sympathie* he devotes nearly eighty pages to this subject, taking the above-mentioned passage of Sextus as his point of departure, and finding his material in Plutarch, Julian, Macrobius, and the Hermetic corpus. I desire to examine his argument section by section.¹

I

The eschatological fragment of Sextus, which everyone agrees is of Stoic origin, begins, Reinhardt says, with two ideas: first, that the soul rises, in accordance with its nature, since it consists of a fiery pneuma; second, that the soul holds itself together without the body; for previously too the body was not the cause of its preservation; it was the soul that held the body together, so much the more, itself. Then there follows this passage:

ἔκσκηνοι γοῦν ἡλίον γενόμεναι τὸν ὑπὸ σελήνην οἰκοῦσι τόπον, ἐνθάδε τε διὰ τὴν εἰλικρίνειαν τοῦ ἀέρος πλείονα πρὸς διαμονὴν λαμβάνουσι

¹ I am omitting a discussion of the section entitled "Helios Demiurgos," which deals largely with the sixteenth Hermetic tractate.

χρόνον, τροφή τε χρῶνται οἰκεία τῇ ἀπὸ γῆς ἀναθυμιάσει ὥς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἄστρο, τὸ διαλῦσόν τε αὐτὰς ἐν τοῖς τόποις οὐκ ἔχουσιν.

This may conceivably be taken with the first idea or with the second.

Im ersten Falle gäbe er das Ziel des Aufstiegs an: die Seelen steigen auf zum Monde. Im zweiten Fall enthielte er die Begründung des Gedankens, dass die Seele, unabhängig von dem Leib, sich selbst zusammenhalte; das, wovon gehandelt würde, wären allgemein Bedingungen und Möglichkeit der Existenz einer vom Körper freien Seele. Die Verbindung [γούν] wie der Inhalt [διαμονή] sprechen für das Zweite. Wenn die Seele sich zusammenhält und nicht der Leib die Seele, muss sie sich zusammenhalten, folglich existieren, ehe sie den Leib zusammenhielt. Es wäre also möglich, diesen Satz nicht von der Hinkunft, sondern von der Herkunft zu verstehen. Die Seelen kommen von der Sonne, weilen eine längere Zeit in der Region des Mondes, führen dort im reinen Element ein körperloses Leben, von derselben "Ausdünstung" genährt wie die Gestirne und der Auflösung an diesem Ort entrückt.

Such a sense, Reinhardt admits, is not most clearly expressed; but he insists that there are grave difficulties even if we take the first and usual interpretation. What is the meaning of πλείονα πρὸς διαμονὴν λαμβάνουσι χρόνον? Where do the souls go when this time is past? The phrase ἔκσκηνοι ἡλίου is not to be tampered with. "ἔκσκηνος ist einwandfrei gebildet, wie ἔκνομος, ἔκσπονδος usw., von derselben Bedeutung von σκηνή wie σκηνεῖσθαι, σκηνόω 'sein Quartier haben.'" The phrase can mean only "after their departure from the region of the sun they dwell in the region beneath the moon." He finds support for this usage in Apocalypse of John 12:12: εὐφραίνεσθε οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες, as also in Plato *Republic* 614E, and Hermias *In Phaedrum*, page 161 (Couvreux). Finally, after referring to the later forms of the doctrine of the stations of the soul in its descent and ascent, he asks:

Weshalb aber redet Sextus nur von einer Dauer unter dem Monde? Weshalb nicht von einem Dasein um die Sonne? Weil die Sonne zwar der Ursprung der Seelen ist, doch ein individuelles Leben um die Sonne nicht zu denken wäre. Der Ort, wo das Leben in getrennter Form sich zu entfalten anfängt, ist die tiefere, dichtere und kühlere Region des Mondes. Weshalb dann jener Ursprung aus der Sonne? Weil die Sonne, offenbar, der Quell des Lebens ist.

In the very beginning of his discussion Reinhardt has taken as proof that this passage is Posidonian the fact that the idea that the soul

holds together both itself and the body is expressly attributed to Posidonius by Achilles *Comment. in Arat.*, page 41 (Maass). I have no desire to deny that this passage of Sextus may be Posidonian; but the alleged proof is by no means cogent. In the first place, anyone who asserted the independent existence of the soul was bound to take this stand. In the second place, the very phrasing is found in Aristotle *De anima* 411 b 6: *τί οὖν δὴ ποτε συνέχει τὴν ψυχὴν, εἰ μεριστὴ πέφυκεν; οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὸ γε σῶμα. δοκεῖ γὰρ τοῖναντίον μᾶλλον ἢ ψυχὴ τὸ σῶμα συνέχειν.* Cf. Heinemann, *Poseidonios' metaphysische Schriften*, II, 33. We may compare the passages which assert that pneuma and fire hold together both themselves and other things.¹

But, whatever the origin of the passage, Reinhardt's interpretation is most improbable. The objection to the ordinary interpretation is purely imaginary; *πλείονα πρὸς διαμονὴν λαμβάνουσι χρόνον* is most appropriate to a Stoic. No soul could maintain an individual existence in the *ἐκπύρωσις*. Chrysippus, indeed, held that the souls of all save the wise were dissolved after a term before the *ἐκπύρωσις*. Again, *πλείονα χρόνον* is more difficult in Reinhardt's interpretation. Are we to suppose that the soul's stay upon the moon is longer than the term of its union with the sun, its true home? If soul-substance comes from the sun, why is it any wonder that the individualized soul does not dissolve immediately in the moon? When it is said that souls have a longer term of existence in the moon, that there is nothing there to dissolve them, we would naturally expect the alternative to their *διαμονή* to be their dissolution, not their birth on earth in human bodies. We should note, too, that in his summing-up of the passage Reinhardt introduces an idea which is suggested by nothing in Sextus on any interpretation: "Um *sich* in der Region des Mondes, als an der ersten Station ihres Kreislaufs, durch ein längeres Leben zu *entfallen*."

I cannot accept Reinhardt's defense of *ἐκσκηνοὶ ἡλίον*. The verbs *κατασκηναῖσθαι*, *κατασκηνοῦσθαι* which he cites from Plato and Hermias are used of a temporary sojourn of the soul. A word compounded with *σκήνος*, *σκηνή* is not to be used of the source or true home of anything; such a use of *ἐκσκηνος* as he imagines would have been against all Greek feeling, in view of the occurrence of *σκήνος* in the sense of the tabernacle of the body; cf. the fragments of Democritus, the pseudo-

¹ Von Arnim, *Stoic. vet. frag.*, II, 144, ll. 26-27; 146, l. 29.

Platonic *Axiochus*, *Timaeus Locrus*, the New Testament. The examples of *σκηνοῦντες* in the Apocalypse seem without parallel, and can offer but little support to a theory. The words *ἐσκηνοὶ ἡλίου* must still remain a great puzzle.

Whether or not this eschatological fragment is from Posidonius, we find in it nothing but the conventional theory that the souls of the dead maintain an individual existence for a term in the region of the moon.

II

In the myth at the end of Plutarch's *De facie in orbe lunae* Reinhardt finds the explanation of the eschatological fragment of Sextus. It will make both for clarity and for fairness if I give a brief summary of his argument.

To be distinguished from the "first eschatological myth," in which only purified souls reach the moon, and from the moon-demonology is "eine psychologische und kosmologische und astrophysische Theorie," which in brief is this:

Aller Nus stammt von der Sonne; in den Weltraum ausgestrahlt, wird er zum Samen bei der Urzeugung der Seelen in der Mondregion; die Seelen vereinigen sich mit dem Leib in der Region der Erde; darauf läuft derselbe Wechsel wieder aufwärts bis zur Sonne. Wie es eine doppelte Geburt gibt, gibt es einen zweiten Tod in der Region des Mondes; er tritt ein, indem der Nus sich von der Seele wieder scheidet.

The ruling idea in this theory is that of the *ἡγεμονικόν*. The *νοῦς* is as little a part of the soul as the soul is a part of the body. The *νοῦς* is contained in the soul as the soul in the body.

Also gibt es nicht verschiedene Seelenteile, *λογικὸν καὶ ἄλογον*, der Nus ist Hegemonikon der Seele, wie die Seele Hegemonikon des Leibes.

The absence of different parts of the soul suggests to our minds Posidonius.

Der Ursprung dieser Eschatologie ist dort zu suchen, wo der Gedanke des Mikrokosmos zugleich eine solche Durchbildung und Systematisierung, zugleich eine solche Steigerung ins Gefühl erlangt hat, dass die Frage nach der Herkunft ihrer Kräfte, das Problem der seelischen Bestandteile mit dem Problem der Quellen des Organischen und das Problem des Individuums mit dem des Alls zusammenfiel.

The conception of the soul as light or as fire, which Plutarch has attached to the first myth, can come from no one except Posidonius. The rôle played by the sun points to him too.

Die Sonne "sät" den Nus, und zwar τῷ ζωτικῷ, d.h. durch ihre vis vitalis; da sie selbst ein Zoon ist, so zeugt sie auch als Zoon. Ihren Samen empfängt als weibliches Gestirn der Mond und gebiert die Seelen: εἴτα τὸν νοῦν αἰθῆς ἐπισπείραντος τοῦ ἡλίου τῷ ζωτικῷ δεχομένη νέας ποιεῖ ψυχάς.

We find in the description of Arabia in Diodorus, which is taken from Posidonius, the theory of the sun as the source of all *Lebenskraft*. Who else combined such a doctrine of *Lebenskraft* with such a doctrine of *Sonnenkraft*? So, too, the position of the moon as female principle points to Posidonius, for it was he who introduced into the *wissenschaftliche Weltbild* ideas of *συμπάθεια* applied to the moon. But why is the sun the source of *νοῦς*? It is because the sun itself is the *νοῦς* of the universe. So in Cicero *Somnium Scipionis* 17 the sun is called "dux et princeps et moderator luminum reliquorum, mens mundi et temperatio, tanta magnitudine, ut cuncta sua luce lustret et compleat." There is no word here that cannot be paralleled from Posidonius. It is difficult to separate "νοῦς of world" from "heart of world," which is found in the fifteenth chapter of *De facie*. From the presence of much that is demonstrably Posidonian in Macrobius *In Somnium Scipionis* i. 20. 6 we may infer that all the material for the interpretation of Cicero's words about the sun is from this philosopher; therefore the equation of heart of world and *νοῦς* of world. There is close agreement between Plutarch and Theon, page 187 (Hiller), a passage which Tannery and Cumont have assigned to Posidonius. The absence of astrological speculation in these authors is of much significance.

Herz ist die Sonne, nicht weil sie dem Herzen zugeordnet wird, sondern weil auch der Makrokosmos, als das einige Lebewesen, das er ist, ein Hegemonikon und einen Quell besitzen muss, aus dem all seine Ordnung und Vernunft, all seine Wärme, all sein Blut, all seine Lebenskräfte strömen.

He who held the sun to be the source of life in his theory of the soul must have held it to be the source of life to the universe. The theory of the moon set forth in *De facie*, chapter 25, closely resembles attested Posidonian material in Priscian *Solutiones ad Chosroem*. From Posidonius, too, comes the theory of the *κρᾶσις* of planets found in

Cicero, Vitruvius, Pliny, and Ptolemy's *Tetrabiblos*. The position of the moon in the eschatological theory is analogous to its position in these physical systems.

Erfunden haben kann dies nur ein Stoiker. Nur einer, der gelehrt hat, nicht der Körper halte die Seele zusammen, sondern die Seele den Körper wie sich selbst. Nur einer, der verschiedene Seelenkräfte, aber nicht verschiedene Seelenteile unterschied. Nur einer, der die Substanz der Seele für lichtartig hielt. Nur einer, der in der Sonne eine "Lebenskraft," ein ζωτικόν sich äussern sah, nur einer, der sie für den Nus des Kosmos hielt.

If this eschatology is not from Posidonius, from whom is it?

I desire to show that the so-called "theory" has not been proved to be derived from Posidonius; that it contains features which make such a source impossible; that the belief which Reinhardt shares with Cumont that Posidonius was the father of "solar theology" is unsupported by evidence. And I wish to call attention to certain sources, neglected if not unknown, the consideration of which contributes much to the understanding of this myth and of later eschatologies in general.

The ruling idea of the "theory," says Reinhardt, is that of τὸ ἡγεμονικόν. While it may seem captious to object that this word is found nowhere in the myth, it is hardly ingenuous for one who is about to prove a Stoic origin to introduce a Stoic technical term which does not occur in the text. But it is much more important to observe that when Plutarch says that man is composed of three elements—body, ψυχή, and νοῦς—when he denies that the νοῦς is a part of the ψυχή, he is saying nothing which bears the faintest resemblance to Posidonius' denial of parts of the soul. Our authority for this denial is Galen (*Hippocrat. et Plat.* vi. 2 [Müller, p. 501, l. 10]): ὁ δ' Ἀριστοτέλης τε καὶ ὁ Ποσειδώνιος εἶδη μὲν ἡ μέρη ψυχῆς οὐκ ὀνομάζουσιν, δυνάμεις δὲ εἶναι φασὶ μᾶς οὐσίας ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ὀρμωμένης. If it is wrong to call the νοῦς a μέρος, it is worse to call it a δύναμις.¹ Further, according to Diogenes Laertius vii. 157, Posidonius agreed with Zeno and Antipater in describing the soul as πνεῦμα ἐνθερμον. If this and similar

¹ If we may judge by the example of Aristotle, and the phrase τοῦ ἀλόγου μέρους in Posidonius' definition of the *summum bonum* in Clement *Strom.* ii. 21, Posidonius may have found it difficult to follow his own principle. Reinhardt's argument upon this point resembles that of Maximilian Adler in his dissertation, *Quibus ex fontibus Plutarchus libellum de facie in orbe lunae hauserit*, p. 172. Cf. my dissertation, *The Platonism of Plutarch*, p. 55.

phrases mean that the soul is composed of two elements, fire and air,¹ we have no indication in any of our authorities that any Stoic ever suggested that the fiery part could be separated from the airy. This lack of evidence is, of course, not proof positive that Posidonius could not have separated the two elements, but the identity of his definition with that of Zeno and Antipater creates a presumption against any such theory, which must be overcome by evidence. And this Reinhardt has not been able to do.

Die Sonne "sät" den Nus, und zwar τῷ ζωτικῷ, d.h. durch ihre vis vitalis; da sie selbst ein Zoon ist, so zeugt sie auch als Zoon. Ihren Samen empfängt als weibliches Gestirn der Mond und gebiert die Seelen.

Thus Reinhardt interprets the text: εἶτα τὸν νοῦν αὐθις ἐπισπείραντος τοῦ ἡλίου τῷ ζωτικῷ δεχομένη νέας ποιῇ ψυχάς. Such a grotesque interpretation can be accepted only if it be inevitable and if none other present itself; and if it were accepted, we should be strongly tempted to regard the language as merely figurative. But the words used do not favor Reinhardt's position; ἐπισπείρειν seems not to be used of "begetting," and δεχομένη νέας ποιῇ ψυχάς is too colorless, if the moon as weibliches Gestirn is to be represented as giving birth to souls.² Reinhardt's long arguments fail to convince us that the attribution to the sun of τὸ ζωτικόν is the property of Posidonius; it is useless to cite parallels for so ancient a commonplace, but reference may be made to Anaxagoras (Diels, I³, 399) from [Aristotle] *De plantis* 817 a 23, where the sun is called "father," to Plato *Republic* vi. 509B, to Aristotle *passim*.³

To return to Plutarch's distinction between the νοῦς and the ψυχή, we note that in 944F the νοῦς is interpreted as the true self: αὐτός τε γὰρ ἕκαστος ἡμῶν οὐ θυμός ἐστιν οὐδὲ φόβος οὐδ' ἐπιθυμία, καθάπερ

¹ Cf. Alexander Aphrod. *De anima*, p. 26, l. 13 (Bruns); Galen *περὶ ψυχῆς ἡθῶν* iv. 738K.

² Sexual language applied to the sun and moon is not unknown in Plutarch, perhaps borrowed partly from folk ideas; cf. *De facie* 944E: καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴν τὴν σελήνην ἱρωτὶ τοῦ ἡλίου περιπολεῖν ἀεὶ καὶ συγγίγνεσθαι ὀρεγομένην ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ γονιμώτατον.† But this follows immediately a Platonic-Aristotelian passage which Reinhardt insists is Plutarch's own addition to the Posidonian "theory." Also cf. *De Iside et Osiride* 372E: τὰς κρήφεις καὶ τοὺς περισκισμοὺς ἐν οἷς διώκει ποθοῦσα τὸν ἡλιον; cf. also Roscher, *Selene*, pp. 76-77. These passages offer no support to Reinhardt.

³ I pass over the fact that the older interpreters took τῷ ζωτικῷ with what follows. I am inclined to think that Reinhardt is right in taking it with what precedes.

οὐδὲ σάρκες οὐδ' ὑγρότητες, ἀλλ' ᾧ διανοούμεθα καὶ φρονούμεν. In *De sera vindicta* 564C a supernatural voice says to Aridaeus, μοῖρα τιμὴ θεῶν ἡκεις δεῦρο τῷ φρονούντι· τὴν δ' ἄλλην ψυχὴν ὥσπερ ἀγκύριον ἐν τῷ σώματι καταλέλοιπας; and in *De genio Socratis* it is denied that the ψυχὴ of Hermodorus left his body; rather, it relaxed the bond and allowed the δαίμων, i.e., the νοῦς, to go forth. It is plain from the two latter myths that Plutarch conceives that it is possible for the νοῦς, τὸ φρονοῦν, to act apart from the lower soul before the death of the body. What right, then, has Reinhardt to assume that in the *De facie* the νοῦς loses its individuality on its return to the sun?

We have seen that Reinhardt can find no Stoic example of the treatment of the νοῦς and the ψυχὴ as separate substances. To most earlier interpreters this idea has seemed Platonic. And if we examine the passage of the *Timaeus* 41, which makes the sharpest distinction between the immortal, the rational soul, and the mortal, the irrational, we find the explanation of much of Plutarch's theory. After the Creator has fashioned the immortal souls and placed them each in its kindred star to learn the laws of its being, he sows them, ἐσπείρειν, in the ὅργανα χρόνου, i.e., the planets and the earth, to assume mortal bodies. The creation of the mortal soul and of the body he leaves to the created gods, i.e., the planetary gods. While it cannot be doubted that Plato's meaning is that souls are to be incarnated upon the planets as well as upon the earth, we know that as early as the *Timaeus* Locrus the interpretation was given that souls are to be brought down to earth from the various planets.¹ We have, then, the closest parallel between Plutarch and the *Timaeus*; we have in both a sharp distinction between the higher and the lower soul, and a different origin assigned to each. Plutarch uses the verb ἐπισπείρειν; Plato, σπείρειν. A further consideration of the influence of this passage of the *Timaeus* I shall postpone until after my discussion of Reinhardt's treatment of Plutarch.

The sun is the νοῦς of the world according to the "theory," says Reinhardt, in spite of the fact that such a statement is found nowhere in the myth. He compares what he regards as an isolated Posidonian passage in Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, § 17: "dux et princeps et moderator luminum reliquorum, mens mundi et temperatio, tanta

¹ *Op. cit.* 99D-E.

magnitudine, ut cuncta sua luce lustret et compleat." He then goes on to a discussion of an earlier section of the *De facie*, chapter 15, in which he finds Posidonian elements,¹ viz., the comparison of the sun to the heart, since the former distributes light and heat to the universe as the latter distributes πνεῦμα and blood to the body, and the former receives vapors from the earth and ocean as the latter receives nourishment from the lower parts of the body; and the comparison of the moon to the liver, since the moon refines the vapors from below and transmits them to the sun, as the liver refines nourishment from the lower organs and transmits it to the heart. Now Reinhardt's parallel from Eustathius *De Graecorum theologia* 44 is clear proof that what is said about the sun is Stoic, whether Posidonian or not. But there is no proof that the correlation of the moon to the liver goes back to that school. It seems unlikely, in view of the fact that their conventional doctrine is that the sun is fed by exhalations from the ocean, the moon by exhalations from fresh water. Would Posidonius or any reputable Stoic have held that all the nourishment of the heavenly bodies is transmitted by the moon; that the moon keeps what rises from fresh water, purifies and passes on what rises from the ocean?

After achieving such a meager result, that there were Stoics who called the sun the heart of the universe, Reinhardt turns to Macrobius' commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis*, § 17, in which Macrobius explains *mens mundi* by *cor caeli*. From a parallel to Cicero *De natura deorum* ii. 24, from the fact that *physici* who are cited for the size of the sun turn out to be Eratosthenes and Posidonius, from the occurrence in the comment on *temperatio mundi* of the theory involved in the attested Posidonian account of the Milky Way, Reinhardt infers that all of Macrobius' material for the interpretation of the predicates of the sun in Cicero is drawn from Posidonius; therefore Macrobius' equation of *mens mundi* and *cor caeli* is Posidonian.

But *De natura deorum* ii. 24, whether from Posidonius or not, contains nothing but conventional Stoic doctrine; the reference to Posidonius for the size of the sun is but feeble support; the theory involved in the explanation of the Milky Way is so at variance with

¹ Reinhardt is wrong in saying "wendet sich Plutarch gegen den mechanischen Naturbegriff der Epikureer." In spite of his use of some Stoic material, Plutarch is arguing against the Stoics; cf. 922F.

Stoic physics that even if Posidonius held it, we can hardly suppose he originated it.¹ There is, however, a part of Macrobius' commentary, viz., his explanation of *moderator luminum reliquorum*, where we have adequate material for testing the possibility of a Posidonian origin (i. 20. 4-5):

moderator reliquorum dicitur, quia ipse cursus eorum recursusque certa spatii definitione moderatur. nam certa spatii definitio est, ad quam cum una quaeque erratica stella recedens a sole pervenerit, tamquam ultra prohibeatur accedere, agi retro videtur, et rursus cum certam partem recedendo contigerit, ad directi cursus consueta revocatur. ita solis vis et potestas motus reliquorum luminum constituta dimensione moderatur.

That is to say, the motion of the planets is explained by the attraction and repulsion of the sun. A fairly clear statement of this theory is found in Bouché-Leclercq, *L'Astrologie grecque*, pages 117 ff. Fortunately, we have definite information concerning Posidonius' planetary theory in a fragment of Geminus' epitome of Posidonius' *Meteorology*, preserved in Simplicius *In physica* (Diels, p. 291): διὰ τί ἀνωμάλως ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ οἱ πλάνητες φαίνονται κινούμενοι; ὅτι εἰ ὑποθώμεθα (sic!) ἐκκέντρους αὐτῶν τοὺς κύκλους ἢ κατ' ἐπίκυκλον πολούμενα τὰ ἄστροα, σωθήσεται ἡ φαινόμενη ἀνωμαλία αὐτῶν; and below, ληπτέον δὲ αὐτῷ (i.e., τῷ ἀστρολόγῳ) ἀρχὰς παρὰ τοῦ φυσικοῦ, ἀπλὰς εἶναι καὶ ὁμαλὰς καὶ τεταγμένας κινήσεις τῶν ἄστροων. The theory of eccentrics and the theory of epicycles are fully in accord with the canon of the physicist; the theory of attraction and repulsion by the sun is utterly at variance. We must conclude that the latter theory was quite impossible for Posidonius, or else, what Reinhardt would presumably refuse to admit, that our philosopher was of so frivolous a mind as to contradict himself on the gravest physical questions.² Unless we admit the latter possibility, we have at least one section of the commentary on the predicates of the sun which is not from Posidonius. And this invali-

¹ For this see the discussion of the *κρᾶσις* of the planets below.

² On p. 58, n. 2, Reinhardt seems to claim the attraction-repulsion theory for Posidonius: "Von Poseidonios haben dann die Astrologen ihre Lehre übernommen von der Kraft der Anziehung und Abstossung, wodurch die Sonne die Planeten abwechselnd von sich forttreibe und zu sich zurückführe; Vitruv ix. 1. 12, Plin. n. h. ii. 69 ff. Franz Cumont, *La Théologie solaire du paganisme romain*." That Posidonius tried to combine this theory with that of epicycles as Pliny did with such ill effects I cannot believe.

dates the argument, which otherwise is far from cogent, that Macrobius' equation of *mens mundi* and *cor caeli* must be from Posidonius.¹

Reinhardt goes on to discuss a passage of Theon of Smyrna (Hiller, p. 187), which Tannery and Cumont have suspected to be of Posidonius origin. Theon is giving alternative theories of the motions of Mercury, Venus, and the sun. The first theory assumes one deferent and one epicycle for each, the sun being placed nearest the earth, as is clear from the corresponding passage in Chalcidius, chapter 112; the second, one deferent for all, on which, indeed, the sun itself moves, and two epicycles, one for Mercury and one for Venus. Theon adds:

ὑποπτεύσειε δ' ἂν <τις> καὶ τὴν ἀληθεστέραν θέσιν τε καὶ τάξιν εἶναι ταύτην, ἵνα τοῦ κόσμου, ὡς κόσμου καὶ ζῶον, τῆς ἐμπυχίας ἢ τόπος οὗτος, ὥσανεὶ καρδίας τοῦ παντός ὄντος τοῦ ἡλίου πολυθέρμον διὰ τὴν κίνησιν καὶ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὴν συνοδίαν τῶν περὶ αὐτόν. ἄλλο γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἐμπύχοις τὸ μέσον τοῦ πράγματος, τουτέστι τοῦ ζῶον ἢ ζώου, καὶ ἄλλο τοῦ μεγέθους. οἶον, ὡς ἔφαμεν, ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἄλλο μὲν, ὡς ἀνθρώπων καὶ ζῶων, τῆς ἐμπυχίας μέσον τὸ περὶ τὴν καρδίαν, αἰκίνητον καὶ πολυθέρμον καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πάσης ψυχικῆς δυνάμεως οὔσαν ἀρχήν, οἶον ψυχικῆς καὶ κατὰ τόπον ὀρμητικῆς, ὀρεκτικῆς καὶ φανταστικῆς καὶ διανοητικῆς, τοῦ δὲ μεγέθους ἡμῶν ἕτερον μέσον, οἶον τὸ περὶ τὸν ὀμφαλόν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοῦ κόσμου παντός, ὡς ἀπὸ βραχέων καὶ τυχόντων καὶ θνητῶν τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τιμιώτατα καὶ θεῖα εἰκάσαι, τοῦ μεγέθους μέσον τὸ περὶ τὴν γῆν κατεψυγμένον καὶ ἀκίνητον· ὡς κόσμου δὲ καὶ ἡ κόσμος καὶ ζῶον τῆς ἐμπυχίας μέσον τὸ περὶ τὸν ἥλιον, οἶονεὶ καρδίαν ὄντα τοῦ παντός, ὅθεν φέρουσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀρξαμένην διὰ παντός ἡκεῖν τοῦ σώματος τεταμένην ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων.

Reinhardt comments thus:

Die Uebereinstimmung dieses Fragments—mit der Kosmologie Plutarchs springt in die Augen: hier wie dort ist es der gleiche Vitalismus, der die Anordnung der Weltkörper nach ihrem Wesensgrund sich zu erklären sucht, und hier wie dort heisst eben dies "Physik." Mit der Erklärung des Macrobius deckt sich wiederum die Lehre von dem Ursprung der Bewegungsenergie.

¹ In i. 20. 6 the title *cor caeli* is said to be applied to the sun by *physici*. Reinhardt lays stress on the fact that in i. 20. 9 the *physici* cited for the size of the sun are Eratosthenes and Posidonius; that is to say, Posidonius. Are we to suppose that Posidonius is meant by the *physici* of *Sat.* i. 21. 1, who say that the upper hemisphere of the earth is called Venus, the lower Proserpina; or by the *physici* of *Comm. in Somn. Scip.* i. 11. 7, who call the moon *aetheriam terram*?

But the passage deserves much more careful treatment than Reinhardt has given it.

We may note first that the resemblance with Plutarch *De facie*, chapter 15, is confined to the assertion that the sun is the heart of the universe; that there is nothing said about *ἀναθυμίασις*; that in Theon we have an explanation by epicycles, whereas in Macrobius we find the theory of attraction and repulsion. Again, Reinhardt says nothing of the fact that in Theon the theory of the sun is attached to an explanation of the motions of Mercury and Venus, which, we learn from Chalcidius, was that of Heraclides Ponticus.¹ Are we to suppose that Reinhardt intends to attribute to Posidonius the acceptance of the Heraclidean theory?² Again, he ignores the fact that the main point that Theon makes, the difference between the center of the vital force and the spatial center, comes originally from Aristotle *De caelo* 293 b 1 ff. It is true, indeed, that Theon's phrasing is not Aristotle's, and that neither in Aristotle nor in his commentators is there a trace of the notion that the sun is the heart of the universe. Further, Reinhardt overlooks the fact that the last clause quoted above, *ὅθεν φέρονσιν*, etc., is a plain reference to Plato *Timaeus* 34B, *ψυχὴν δὲ εἰς τὸ μέσον αὐτοῦ θείσιν διὰ παντός τε ἔτεινεν*, and that the corresponding passage in Chalcidius, chapters 109–10, constitutes a commentary on *Timaeus* 36E, which bears a close resemblance to 34B. Now we learn from Proclus *In Timaeum* ii. 104 that certain interpreters of *Timaeus* 34B took *μέσον* as the center of the earth, some as the moon, some as the sun, *ὡς ἐν τόπῳ καρδίας ἰδρυμένον*, drawing their inference from *ἡ ζωοποιὸς τοῦ ἡλίου θερμότης*. We can hardly escape the conviction that Theon's account of the sun as heart stood in a commentary on the *Timaeus*, though without much question it shows Stoic influence.³ Again, Reinhardt fails to observe that while the Heraclidean theory and the conception of the sun as the center of the

¹ I am aware that Erich Frank denies the authorship of this planetary theory to Heraclides; I mean to answer his arguments elsewhere.

² On pp. 131 ff. Reinhardt tries to prove that the rare planetary order, moon, Venus, Mercury, sun, is Posidonian. This is quite compatible with the Heraclidean theory, if one considers the lower part of the orbits of Mercury and Venus.

³ Fire in the sun precludes an orthodox Peripatetic source, and the rational soul in the heart an orthodox Platonic. It is amusing to observe that if Posidonius could be proved the original of Theon, we could be almost sure of an excerpt from the *Timaeus*-commentary, in which Reinhardt disbelieves.

vital force of the universe both occur in Chalcidius, they are in no wise connected as in Theon, and that the employment of the latter to prove the former in Theon is highly illogical. The theory of Heraclides is found in Chalcidius, chapters 109–11, the discussion of the sun in chapter 100. Chalcidius' own theory of Mercury and Venus is Theon's first theory; but we cannot be sure that it is with this that he means to combine the notion of the sun as the center of vital force, for this latter idea he introduces thus: "quidam dici sic putant." But before discussing the bad logic involved in Theon's argument we should look at a passage of the *Hermippus* (Kroll-Viereck, p. 17, ll. 20 ff.): ὥσπερ τοῖνυν ὁ ἥλιος καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ θερμὸν τὴν μέσσην χώραν ἐν ἅπασιν ἔσχηκεν (i.e., three planets on one side, three on the other), οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐν ζώοις θερμὸν τὴν μέσσην αὐτῶν χώραν ὡς προσφύῃ καὶ οἰκίαν ἐπέλαβε καὶ τὴν καρδίαν ἔσχε δοχεῖον, σφαιρικὴν καὶ ταύτην οὖσαν παρὰ μικρόν. ὅθεν οἱ τὴν δευτέραν περίοδον τῷ ἡλίῳ διδόντες πολὺ τοῦ δέοντος ἀπετρέποντο, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὴν καρδίαν πανταχοῦ μὴ τὴν μέσσην χώραν φήσειεν ἔχειν; i.e., the position of the sun with three planets above and three below is conceived as central, analogous to that of the heart;¹ a position immediately above the moon is regarded as perhaps defensible on the ground that the heart itself is not in the center. The logic of this is sound: the argument of *De caelo* 293b may rightly be used to *defend* a non-central position of the seat of the vital force; it ought not to be used, as it is by Theon, to *prove* a particular position.²

Theon, as little as Plutarch and Macrobius, has yielded any proof that Posidonius is the source of the idea of the primacy of the sun;

¹ Cf. *Hermippus*, p. 6, ll. 9 ff.; p. 36, ll. 16 ff., a passage used by Reinhardt. The planetary order is the "Chaldean," not the variant which Reinhardt attributes to Posidonius.

² One might conjecture that Theon did something like the following: He had before him, though there is no trace of this in Chalcidius, an argument to the effect that the position of the sun as center of the orbits of Mercury and Venus is most suitable in view of its primacy in the universe, reasoning somewhat analogous to that of the Pythagoreans, whom Aristotle opposes in *De caelo*; for we have seen from the *Hermippus* that the idea of the sun's occupying a central position and being the heart occurs without any trace of the Aristotelian argument; the comparison with the heart unfortunately suggested to him an argument which had been used to justify making the sun which is not the spatial center of the universe, the vital center. Who had employed this argument for this purpose we do not know. Boericke (*Quaest. Cleomed.*, p. 43) and Erich Frank (*Plato und die sogenannten Pythagoreer*, p. 346) suggest that it was Cleanthes, arguing against, yet influenced by, the heliocentric theory of Aristarchus.

proof, indeed, is wanting to show that he held such a doctrine in the sense in which Cleanthes held it. In Diogenes Laertius vii. 139 it is plainly stated that Chrysippus and Posidonius regard the heaven (τὸν οὐρανόν) as the ἡγεμονικόν of the universe, Cleanthes the sun; the same statement about Cleanthes is found in Eusebius *Praep. evang.* xv. 15. 7, Censorinus i. 4, Aëtius ii. 4. 16, Cicero *Acad. pr.* ii. 126. Reinhardt's attempted evasion is not convincing (p. 362, n. 1):

Wenn bei Diogenes vii. 139 steht, das Hegemonikon des Kosmos sei nach Chrysipp und Poseidonios der Himmel, nach Kleanthes die Sonne, so bedeutet das zu unseren Folgerungen keinen Widerspruch. Mochte man die Sonne für das Herz oder den Nus der Welt ansehen, so konnte man doch immer noch den Aether als ihr Hegemonikon betrachten. Galt die Sonne doch als Mittelpunkt der Aetherwelt, als dux et princeps et moderator luminum reliquorum. Hegemonikon ist ein relativer Begriff. Danach wäre die Sonne das Hegemonikon der Aetherwelt, wie der Aether das Hegemonikon des Kosmos. Ebenso ist die Seele das Hegemonikon des Leibes, der Nus das Hegemonikon der Seele.

If Posidonius had held the sun to be the ἡγεμονικόν, what reason was there for distinguishing his doctrine from that of Cleanthes? That Posidonius spoke of the power of the sun in the same strain as Cleomedes in the *Sonnenhymnus* is most probable; it is not inconceivable that he called the sun the heart of the world, though there is no evidence to prove it. But there is no reason to believe that he made any contributions to solar theology, or that he assigned to the sun the place in the universe that Cleanthes assigned to it, or that he taught a solar eschatology.

Reinhardt is not alone in regarding Posidonius as the virtual father of solar theology. Franz Cumont in "La Théologie solaire du paganisme romain," *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, Volume XII (1909), comes to a similar conclusion: "Celui qui a d'abord formulé nettement, ou du moins qui a propagé puissamment l'ensemble du système, paraît être le plus influent des stoïciens du 1^{er} siècle, le Syrien Posidonius d'Apamée." There is a great deal that is valuable in Cumont's discussion; but his arguments for the importance of Posidonius are very weak,¹ and, what is perhaps more serious, he

¹ Cumont rests his case upon the passage of the *Somnium Scipionis* quoted above, relying upon Corsen's proof that the theology of this work is Posidonian (Reinhardt accepts only the predicates of the sun); upon Pliny *Hist. nat.* ii. 5. 13, of utterly un-

neglects well-known and significant factors in the development of solar theology.

Among the sources of this doctrine which Cumont ignores are the fragment of Anaxagoras, quoted in [Aristotle] *De plantis* 817 a 23, where the sun is called "father," as the cause of life and growth; Plato *Rep.* 509B, 516B; *Cratylus* 412D; *Theaetetus* 153A, which belongs with the two last-mentioned passages, though fire rather than the sun is under discussion;¹ Aristotle *De generat. et corrupt.* ii. 10, where growth and decay of living things is said to be determined by the oblique course of the sun, an idea which Cumont, on page 469, with great erudition traces back to Posidonius; the fragment of Scythinus, who was under Heraclitean influence, quoted in Plutarch *De Pyth. orac.*, chapter 16; fragments of the *Epicharmus* of Ennius, 48-50a (Diels), where the sun is said to be mind, and the human reason is derived from the sun.²

Cumont discusses the theory of attraction and repulsion of the planets by the sun, finding it already in Berossus,³ but he realizes as little as Reinhardt that its adoption was impossible for Posidonius, unless we are to assume utter inconsistency on his part.⁴

We might naturally have supposed that the planetary theories of the astronomers would have confirmed in certain minds the idea of the primacy of the sun. In Eudoxus' system the third and fourth spheres

certain origin; upon Censorinus, chap. 8, which certainly involves the theory of attraction and repulsion of planets by the sun, a non-Posidonian idea, as I have shown above; and, most strangely, on the myth of the *De facie*: "L'origine des idées eschatologiques développées par Plutarque dans le *De facie in orbe lunae*, M. Heinze l'a démontré, doit être cherchée aussi dans Posidonius." While it is true that Heinze found Posidonian material in the *De facie*, he assigned all the passages that concern the sun to Xenocrates!

¹ It is fairly probable that Plato in these passages is following certain Heracliteans.

² Reinhardt discusses these fragments on pp. 312 and 410, but minimizes their importance unwarrantably.

³ This fact seems assured by Vitruvius ix. 2, although the account as given by the latter can certainly not be correct.

⁴ Cumont, after Bouché-Leclercq, finds this doctrine in Cicero *Somnium Scipionis* 17, and *Tusc. disp.* i. 68, passages where we are not absolutely compelled to assume it, and in *De divinatione* ii. 89, where it certainly is not present. In the latter passage, "cum temporum anni tempestatumque caeli conversiones commutationesque tantae fiant accessu stellarum et recessu, cumque ea vi solis efficiantur, quae videmus," he suppresses the last two words, and takes *ea* as referring to the subjects of the previous clause; the meaning is, of course, "in view of the effects of the sun which we all see, i.e., on living things."

revolve in the synodic period of the planet. In the theory of movable eccentrics, applicable to the outer planets, the center of the eccentric revolves about the earth in one year, the planet revolves on the eccentric in the synodic period; the center of the eccentric lies on the straight line through the earth and the sun. In the theory of epicycles the planet revolves on the epicycle in the synodic period; in the case of the outer planets the line from the center of the epicycle to the planet must be parallel to the line from the earth to the sun, in the case of the inner planets the center of the epicycle must lie on the line through the earth and the sun. Yet we can hardly be sure that the peculiar rôle played by the sun in these theories contributed to the belief in its primacy.¹ It seems very plausible that the theory of the sun as center of the orbits of Mercury and Venus in the system of Heraclides drew with it a corresponding physical theory; and it is almost necessary to assume this in the case of the heliocentric theory of Aristarchus, in view of the analogy with the belief of certain Pythagoreans in the central fire, at once a spatial and a dynamic center. Yet we are virtually without evidence. We ought not, however, to dismiss utterly the possibility of influence of this sort on the doctrine of the supremacy of the sun.

After his discussion of Theon, Reinhardt turns to *De facie*, chapters 25 ff., an account of the nature of the moon, which contains a considerable amount of Posidonian doctrine, as is proved by Priscianus *Solutiones ad Chosroem*, pages 72 ff. (Bywater). But virtually all of this except the theory of the effect of the moon on the tides is folk material, and Reinhardt's contention that Posidonius was the first to introduce it into philosophy is invalidated by a statement of the doctrine of Chrysippus in Stobaeus *Eclogae physicae* (p. 184, 8 W): διὸ καὶ ἀερωδεστέραν φαίνεσθαι καὶ μάλιστα διατείνειν τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῆς (sc. τῆς σελήνης) δύναμιν εἰς τὰ περίγεια; cf. also Aristotle *De generat. animal.* iv. 10.

Reinhardt goes on to attribute to Posidonius the invention of the whole doctrine of the *κρᾶσις* of the planets, as seen, for example, in Cicero *De natura deorum* ii. 119; Vitruvius vi. 1. 11; ix. 1. 16; Pliny *Nat. hist.* ii. 34; Ptolemy *Tetrabiblos*, page 17 (Basel ed.). Though this is of no weight in determining the source of the psychological theory

¹ Cf. Dreyer, *Planetary Systems*, p. 167.

of Plutarch's myth, unless one is convinced of the cogency of all Reinhardt's preceding argument, I should like to point out certain grave difficulties. How is the cold of Saturn compatible with the Stoic doctrine that the stars are fiery? It will not do to say that cold means a less degree of heat; for cold is always treated as a positive quality. Besides, the language used does not favor such an evasion; cf. Cicero *De nat. deor.* ii. 119: "cum summa Saturni refrigeret"; Vitruvius ix. 1. 16: "Saturni autem quod est proxima extremo mundo et tangit congelatas caeli regiones, vehementer est frigida." According to Stoic theory cold is the quality characteristic of air. Are we to suppose that air is the element of Saturn and the frozen regions of the heavens? In the section of the *De nat. deor.* immediately preceding the passage quoted above we read: "sunt autem stellae natura flammeae." What certainty have we that Cicero is following the same source in § 119 as in the rest of his astronomical discussion? Even if we grant, a thing which may well be true, that there were Stoics who said that Saturn is cold, it is much more likely that they borrowed from astrologers a doctrine utterly inconsistent with their physics than that they invented it.¹

We have seen that the psychology of the myth of the *De facie* is not that of Posidonius, but that of the *Timaeus*; that from the *Timaeus*, too, are the words which describe the sowing of the *voûs* in the moon; that there is no proof that Posidonius contributed anything to the doctrine of the primacy of the sun in the universe, or even that he held this doctrine; that the elements of Plutarch's account of the moon which Reinhardt calls Posidonian are, with the exception of the theory of its influence on the tides, commonplaces.

I should like to add a few remarks on certain features of the myth. That all Platonists made a sharp distinction between the higher and the lower soul is too obvious a fact to need exemplification.² Two interesting cases of the occurrence of the idea in thinkers strongly influenced by Platonism are found in Diogenes Laertius viii. 30, in

¹ Besides, Epigenes, who, according to Seneca *Quaest. nat.* vii. 4, spoke of the nature of Saturn as *ventosa et frigida*, seems to have been earlier than Posidonius; cf. Pauly-Wissowa; Christ, II⁶, 448, n. 1.

² For Plutarch himself, in addition to passages already cited, cf. *De mor. virt.* 441D ff., the language of which bears some resemblance to that of *De facie* 943A; the form of the theory seems to be that of *De procr. an.* 1025D-E, 1026D-E; cf. my dissertation, p. 86.

the account of the Pythagorean of Alexander Polyhistor, and in Philo *De fuga* 69, where, in close imitation of the *Timaeus*, God creates the immortal part of the soul, and commits the creation of the mortal part to his *δυνάμεις*; cf. also *De opificio mundi* 72 ff.; *De confusione linguarum* 175 ff.

That the various forms of the later doctrine of the descent and ascent of the soul through the planets are at least in part dependent upon the *Timaeus* can hardly be doubted. The latter involves the distinction of the parts of the soul, the descent of the immortal part from the *ἀπλανής* and its ultimate ascent, the creation of the lower faculties by the created gods, i.e., the planetary gods. It has been said above that the misinterpretation whereby the planets are made way-stations in the descent was as early as *Timaeus Locrus*. It was inevitable that astrological theories of the nature of the particular planets should determine the contribution made by each.¹

In the myth of the *De facie* Plutarch was led to choose the sun as the source of the higher soul partly because of its position in the *Republic* as the offspring of the Idea of Good and as the lord of the visible world,² partly, perhaps, by the fairly frequent conception that it is the *ἡγεμονικόν*, the *νοῦς* of the universe. It is by no means impossible that there existed in his time a theory of the derivation of the soul from the sun.³ But whatever may be the origins of the setting of the myth, the psychological and eschatological ideas are Platonic.

In close connection with the derivation of the *νοῦς* from the sun and of the *ψυχή* from the moon Plutarch quotes *Odyssey* xi. 600-601, where the *εἰδωλον* of Heracles is distinguished from the real Heracles, who is among the gods, and he equates the former with the *ψυχή*, the latter with the *νοῦς*. Such a use of this passage seems to be a part of the

¹ In the type of theory which we find in *Timaeus Locrus* and in Julian *Orat.* iv, according to which each soul is derived from some one planet, we seem to see the influence of the myth of the *Phaedrus* too.

² For the influence of the passages of the *Republic* concerning the sun cf. especially *Quaest. Platon.* 1006F; *De E apud Delphos* 393D: *τιμᾶν δὲ καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆνδε καὶ σέβασθαι τὸ περὶ αὐτὴν γόνυμον*; note the same combination, as in *De facie*, of sun as *εἰκὼν* of the intelligible and as source of life (*τὸ ζωτικόν*).

³ We have, however, no early evidence except the fragments of the *Epicharmus* of Ennius, the meaning of which may conceivably be only that since the soul is fire, the sun, as reservoir of fire, is the source of the soul. For late evidence of the idea cf. Cumont, *op. cit.*, pp. 463 ff. Some of Cumont's examples, however, seem rather to concern the conception of Helios Anagogeus, e.g., *Firmicus Maternus* v. praeft.; Censorinus, chap. 8. Cf. the discussion of Julian *loc. cit.* below.

Platonic tradition; cf. Plotinus iv. 3. 27 and 32; vi. 4. 16; Proclus *In Remp.* i. (Kr., pp. 120, 172).¹ That Plutarch represents the *εἰδωλον*—*ψυχή* as retaining the form of the body is in accordance with the folk idea;² cf. Servius *In Aen.* iv. 654, and pseudo-Plutarch, chapter 123, passages which depend on the interpretation of the same Homeric lines. In Plotinus as in Plutarch we find the conception of a separate existence of the lower soul, with a memory of its own. The lower soul, according to Porphyry, is ultimately absorbed by the planetary spheres, from which it took its origin, just as, according to Plutarch, by the moon.³ Much more unusual is Plutarch's notion that occasionally the lower soul is reincarnated without the *νοῦς*.⁴

While the psychological and eschatological theory does not necessarily involve the moon-demonology, the latter fits into the former logically enough. In fact, what Plutarch says in other passages about demons seems to presuppose a similar, though not the same, type of theory. Demons possess *παθητικόν τι*; certain demons become gods by freeing themselves from this lower element; cf. *De defectu oraculorum* 415B-C; *Vita Romuli*, chapter 28; *De Iside et Osiride* 360D ff.⁵ The theory of the *De facie* is more Platonic, in that in every case the *νοῦς* is eventually freed from the lower soul; cf. *Timaeus* 42, and the myth of the Phaedrus.⁶

It is perhaps worth observing that Reinhardt misinterprets a part of the moon-demonology (p. 326): "Von solchen zur Strafe Reinkarnierten wurden die besseren Idäische Daktylen, Korybanten usw." The careful reading of 944C-E makes it clear that the Dactyls, the Corybantes, the followers of Cronus, are demons of the higher order, not beings punished by rebirth (cf. 942A).

¹ Cf. the important article of Cumont in *Revue de philologie*, 1920, pp. 237 ff. To his list of examples we may add pseudo-Plutarch *De vit. et poes. Hom.* chap. 123.

² There is no trace of such a conception in the Stoics; cf. Eustathius *In Iliad.* 1288. 10 for belief of Chrysippus that souls assume spherical form after death.

³ Cf. Proclus *In Tim.* iii. 234. This seems to have been substantially the doctrine of Plotinus too; cf. iv. 7. 14: ἀφεμμένον δὲ τὸ χεῖρον οὐδὲ αὐτὸ ἀπολεῖσθαι, ἕως ἂν ἡ θθεῖν ἔχει τὴν ἀρχήν; also Iamblichus apud Stob. *Ecl.* i. 384. 19 ff.

⁴ In this way Plutarch accounts for such figures as Python, Tityos, and Typhon.

⁵ Cf. also accounts of deaths of demons in *De defectu orac.* 418 ff.

⁶ The *Timaeus* seems at least to look to the final restoration of all souls. While the psychology of the *Phaedrus* is different, we are not concerned with that fact now, but only with the ultimate ascent to the host of heaven.

III

Reinhardt discovers a fragment of Posidonius in Macrobius *Saturnalia* i. 23. 1-9, a passage in which Praetextatus at the end of his long speech on solar theology identifies Jupiter with the sun. Reinhardt's interpretation is inaccurate; he fails to cite a most illuminating parallel, and his conclusion that Posidonius is the source is highly improbable.

The passage of Macrobius is to this effect: According to Cornificius, when Homer in *Iliad* i. 423 says that Zeus is gone unto Ocean, to the blameless Ethiopians, he means by Zeus the sun, for nourishment is provided to the sun by the waters of Ocean. Posidonius and Cleanthes assert that the reason that the sun never leaves the torrid zone is that this zone is entirely covered by Ocean. The gods who follow Zeus are the stars. We have the same doctrine in Plato's *Phaedrus*: ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς, etc.

his enim verbis magnum in caelo ducem vult sub appellatione Jovis intellegi, alato curru velocitatem sideris monstrans. nam quia in quocunque signo fuerit praestat omnia signa et sidera signorumque praestites deos, videtur cunctos deos ducatu praeire ordinando cuncta ornandoque atque ideo velut exercitum eius ceteros deos haberi per XI signorum partes distributos, quia ipse duodecimi signi, in quocunque signo fuerit, locum occupat. nomen autem daemonum cum deorum appellatione conjungit aut quia di sunt δαίμονες id est scientes futuri aut ut Posidonius scribit in libris quibus titulus est περὶ ἡρώων καὶ δαιμόνων, quia ex aetheria substantia parta atque divisa qualitas illis est, sive ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου, id est καιομένου, seu ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου hoc est μεριζομένου.

When Plato says that Hestia alone remains in the house of the gods, he is thinking of the earth, which alone remains motionless in the world, which is the house of the gods. The "eye of Zeus" in Hesiod *Op. et dies* 267 is the sun.

Reinhardt begins his discussion by translating the sentence, "nam quia, etc.":

Denn da sie Sonne, wo sie auch im Tierkreis stehe, alle Tierkreiszeichen und Gestirne und Herrscher der zwölf Tierkreiszeichen erhält, so scheint sie selbst den ganzen Götterzug zu führen, alles ordnend und verwaltend; als ihr Heer erscheinen, in zwölf Abschnitte geteilt, die übrigen Götter, während sie selbst, wo sie auch stehe, stets im zwölften Zeichen bleibt.

In the first place, in order to get his favorite idea of the *Erhaltung* of the universe by the sun, Reinhardt mistranslates *praestat*, the mean-

ing of which is clearly seen from an earlier passage of the same book, xxi. 7: "primum quia impetu et calore praestat [sc. leo] animalia, uti praestat sol sidera." Again, he substitutes *zwölf* for "XI," an error which is not conducive to the understanding of the passage. Macrobius does not seem to be expressing himself very accurately, but one would suppose his meaning to be: Zeus is the sun, the eleven chief gods are the other eleven signs of the zodiac, the sun taking the place of the sign in which he happens to be. More light is thrown by a parallel in Hermias *In Phaedrum*, pages 138, lines 10 ff. (Couvreur), which has not been generally observed:

Δία μὲν τὸν ἥλιον λαμβάνουσι, τὸν δὲ ὅλον κόσμον φασὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν συντετάχθαι καὶ Ἑστίαν μὲν φασὶ τὸ δωδεκατημόριον ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ὁ ἥλιος, ἐπειδὴ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, τὰ δὲ ἔνδεκα τὰ λοιπὰ ζῳδία συνδημιουργεῖν αὐτῷ· στρατιὰν δ' ἀκούουσι τοὺς δεκαδάρχας θεοὺς καὶ τοὺς μοιρηγέτας δαίμονας.

This statement, which is clearer than that of Macrobius, has obviously the same general meaning, except with regard to the interpretation of Hestia. Hermias' interpretation seems to suit the astrological character of the whole much better than Macrobius'. Now we find Hestia as the earth in Hermias' first explanation. Macrobius probably had before him something like the commentary of Hermias and combined the second theory with a part of the first.¹

Reinhardt goes on to find traces of the interpretation of the Zeus of the *Phaedrus* as the sun in the commentaries on Aratus. By a strange process of reasoning, which I have no space to refute, he traces this back to Diodorus, the follower of Posidonius. It is perfectly true that these commentaries on occasion make Zeus the sun, but the astrological features of Macrobius and Hermias seem to be absent.

Reinhardt then takes up the interpretations of the *δαίμονες* of the *Phaedrus*: The first, *scientes futuri*, is unsatisfactory. "Die zweite Interpretation verleiht dem Ganzen eine Stütze, die so wenig zu entbehren ist, dass man sich fragen muss, ob ohne sie der ganze Sinn bestünde." The heavenly bodies could be called *δαίμονες* because of their substance; *θεοί* and *δαίμονες* are two words for the same thing. But the first explanation is much in point, if one realizes that the

¹ In Hermias' first theory the twelve gods are the *ἀπλανῆς*, the seven planets, the four elements. This view is fairly frequent in antiquity.

passage is astrological. Again, while Macrobius fails in his paraphrase of the *Phaedrus* to distinguish between *θεοί* and *δαίμονες*, Hermias distinguishes between them.

Reinhardt concludes, partly from the citation of Posidonius at the beginning and toward the end of the passage, that the whole must come from him. One feels surprise that that Reinhardt is so eager to make him the source of a patently astrological theory, in view of his insistence on the non-astrological character of other passages he claims for him. And I think we may have a reasonable doubt of the likelihood of any Stoic's putting the sign-gods next in rank to the sun. We have seen, too, that there is no good reason to attribute to Posidonius the idea of the primacy of the sun.

IV

Die Sonne sät den Nus, und zwar $\tau\omega\zeta\omega\tau\iota\kappa\omega$, d.h. durch ihre vis vitalis; da sie selbst ein Zoon ist, so zeugt sie auch als Zoon. Solches lehrt Plutarch. Und übereinstimmend damit besagt die Theorie des Stoikers bei Sextus, dass die Seelen letztthin von der Sonne kommen. Aber steht das nicht auch—bei Julian? In seiner Rede auf den König Helios? *Or.* iv p. 131, C: λέγεται γὰρ ὁρθῶς ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον γεννᾶν καὶ ἥλιος ψυχάς, οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν (den Gestirnen) σπείρων εἰς γῆν. D.h., so wahr der Satz ist, dass der Mensch den Menschen zeugt (nach Aristoteles, *Metaph.* N 5 p. 1092a 16), so wahr ist auch, dass die Sonne die Seelen zeugt: sie "sät" die Seelen aus sich selbst wie von den anderen Göttern her zur Erde nieder. Da erscheint die Eschatologie des Poseidonios.

Reinhardt mispunctuates the text of Julian, putting a comma after *ψυχάς* instead of after *ἥλιος*; refers to *Met.* 1092 a 16: ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἄνθρωπον γεννᾷ, instead of *Phys.* 194 b 13: ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἄνθρωπον γεννᾷ καὶ ἥλιος; ignores the origin in the *Timaeus* of σπείρων; introduces the idea of the sun's begetting like a ζῶον in a context where it would be still more absurd than in Plutarch; what could *παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν* mean?¹

Reinhardt finds the meteorology of Posidonius combined with the eschatology in 151D ff. Julian is explaining the phenomena of the atmosphere and changes on the earth by the action of the sun, which

¹ Reinhardt similarly misinterprets Julian 151D: ἄνθρωπον γὰρ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου γεννᾶσθαι φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ ἥλιου; he puts an asterisk after Ἀριστοτέλης, evidently suspecting the text, and translates: "Denn wie der Mensch den Menschen zeugt, nach Aristoteles, so auch die Sonne."

causes the two exhalations, the moist and the dry, to rise. While it would seem from Seneca *Nat. quaest.* ii. 54 that Posidonius held this theory, he evidently borrowed it from the *Meteorology* of Aristotle; cf. 341 b 6 ff., and many other passages. It is very significant that the Stoic doctrine of exhalations rising to the sun and stars is not found here,¹ for that would have afforded a better physical parallel to the conception of *ἥλιος ἀναγωγείς*.

The two chief elements in Julian's eschatology are the passage of the *Timaeus* to which we have so often referred, and the theory that the sun is the cause of the birth of souls in bodies and of their release from the body, *ἥλιος ἀναγωγείς*. In 131C the sun sows souls on the earth, taking them from itself and the other heavenly bodies. In the *Timaeus* the demiurgus sows them in the organs of time. Julian, however, says nothing here about the creation of the lower soul. In 152B we find that the sun restores souls to the stars from which it has taken them: *εἴτα ἐπανάγων ἐπὶ τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ συγγενεῖς οὐσίας*. The theory of Julian is not true solar eschatology. He expects himself to return to the sun as his eternal home; cf. 158B: *ἀνοδὸν τε ἐπ' αὐτὸν . . . καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ, μάλιστα μὲν αἰδίων, εἰ δὲ τοῦτο μείζον εἴη τῶν ἐμοὶ βεβιωμένων, πολλὰς πάνυ καὶ πολυτετεῖς περιόδους*; but that is because he is of the train of the sun; cf. 157A: *ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐξ αἰδίου ψυχὴν ὑπέστησεν, ὁπαδὸν ἀποφύνας αὐτοῦ*; not because all souls return to the sun. Julian's theory seems influenced by the *Phaedrus*-myth; cf. the fragment of a letter (Bidez-Cumont, pp. 209-10) from Eunapius, fragment 24:

ὅτι ὁ Ἰουλιανὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἴδιον <πατέρα> ἀνακαλεῖ τὸν Ἥλιον, οὐχ ὥσπερ Ἀλέξανδρος διαβάλλεσθαι φάσκων πρὸς τὴν Ἥραν ὅτι Ὀλυμπιάς αὐτὸν ἐκ Διὸς ἀνελομένη τοῦτο οὐκ ἀπεκρύπτετο, ἀλλ' οὗτός γε ἐπὶ ταῖς τοῦ θεοῦ μαρτυρίαις αἰωρούμενος ἐς τὸν Πλάτωνα ὑποφέρεται, ὥσπερ ὁ ἐκείνου Σωκράτης φησί· μετὰ μὲν Διὸς ἡμεῖς, ἄλλοι μετ' ἄλλου τοῦ θεῶν.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

¹ It is important to observe that this Stoic doctrine is lacking also in Vitruvius ix. 1. 12, where the attraction exerted by the sun on the planets is compared to the attraction exerted on water vapor and growing things.

SPARTA AND THE IONIAN REVOLT: A STUDY OF SPARTAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE GENESIS OF THE PELOPONNESIAN LEAGUE

By JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

THERE has appeared recently an interesting article by De Sanctis on Aristagoras of Miletus.¹ The primary purpose of the study is to get away from the motivation of Herodotus and to attempt to give a rational explanation of the Ionian Revolt in general and of the work of Aristagoras in particular. In connection with this the author discusses also the visits of Aristagoras to Sparta and Athens. He emphasizes the fact that intervention in Ionia was not necessarily foolish. A Persian attack on Greece could be anticipated, and it might have been wise to have forestalled invasion by means of co-operation with the Ionians.² De Sanctis deserves thanks for his statement of this truth, though the point of view is not entirely new.³ Aristagoras, he believes, was well aware that the intervention of Sparta would have meant Spartan hegemony, but he thought the price worth paying. The intervention of the Peloponnesian League would have meant the support of the two most powerful fleets of Greece proper, those of Corinth and Aegina, and there was even some

¹ "Aristagora di Mileto," *Rivista di filologia*, LIX (1931), 48-72.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 66.

³ Thirlwall, whose treatment, however, of the Ionian Revolt as a whole certainly would not satisfy De Sanctis, remarks concerning the dispatch of aid on the part of the Athenians: "It does not appear that in this case they were either grossly deceived, or flagrantly rash. The twenty ships were indeed the occasion of events they could not have dreamt of; but they might not unreasonably consider the measure as one of prudent precaution, by which an avowed enemy was occupied at home, and diverted from an attack with which he had already threatened them" (*History of Greece*, II, 213 f.). Grote also notes that the Athenians "had a powerful interest in sustaining the Ionic revolt as an indirect protection to themselves" (*History of Greece*, IV [London: John Murray, 1847], 388). On the other hand, he holds that Sparta had no interest in intervening "and would have been provoking a new enemy by meddling in the Asiatic war." It is just to criticize these historians for failing to note that the force sent by Athens was too small to be of any avail. The same criticism cannot be made of the statement in How and Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, II, 351, in which Herodotus' account of the visit of Aristagoras to Cleomenes is said to be from a Spartan source and is described as "an apology for the shortsighted and selfish policy of leaving the Ionians to their fate."

hope of being able to transport Spartan hoplites to Asia and by their aid keep the enemy away from the coast.¹

So far so good. De Sanctis deserves nothing but thanks for his effort to make sense out of the Ionian Revolt. Yet one might well wish that he had taken the further step of analyzing the situation in Greece to see whether at the time Sparta was in a position to intervene and particularly whether, as head of the Peloponnesian League, she was able to count confidently on the support of the fleets of both Corinth and Aegina. It might seem that such an investigation would take him too far afield, yet on its result must depend to some extent the judgment to be passed both on Aristagoras who requested Spartan aid and on Cleomenes who refused to grant it.

The writer wishes to discuss briefly the point just referred to, namely, the problem of the nature of the Spartan leadership in the Peloponnesus and the strength of the Spartan power at the time of the outbreak of the Ionian Revolt. He is well aware that the entire period is difficult, and that it probably is impossible ever to reach a final solution of the many enigmas connected with the troubled but fascinating period from about 520 to 490 B.C. In many cases the account of Herodotus stands alone. It is obvious that where we have only one informant we are never safe. It is also obvious that Herodotus is far from supplying an exception to this rule. Yet it has seemed best to follow the simple procedure of considering that the facts and events recorded by him generally are correct, but that his motivation and explanations have little value. This procedure cannot give definitive solutions of all problems but does produce the best result obtainable at present. Yet even when there is agreement on the general principle, there is likely to be considerable difference of opinion in detail. In the present paper much of the argument depends on a distinction between the attempt at military intervention in Attica—reported in Herodotus v. 74 f.—made by Cleomenes in 507 or 506 B.C. and the later meeting of the assembly of the Peloponnesian League—reported in Herodotus v. 91 ff.—at which Sparta proposed to restore Hippias at Athens. It is the opinion of Beloch and De Sanctis that Herodotus has not reported two events but given two different accounts of the same event, and apparently the two scholars feel so certain of the point that they

¹ De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

do not consider it necessary to argue the case at all.¹ In opposition to this view the writer believes that it is a dangerous procedure to conclude that two stories that have some elements in common must be two accounts of the same event. Furthermore, he believes that there is internal evidence in Herodotus which indicates that he carefully distinguished between the two events. In v. 91 Herodotus, in reporting the meeting of the assembly of the Peloponnesian League, inserts in the speech of the Spartans a reference to the fact that the Boeotians and Chalcidians have already learned what a mistake it was to expel Hippias. This reference can be understood only as implying that the defeats of the Boeotians and Chalcidians, which took place the same year as the military intervention attempted by Cleomenes, were events of the past. Herodotus obviously means to report two distinct events, and it is unlikely that he was completely mistaken on such a fundamental point. Finally, the writer is of the opinion that to accept the two events as distinct not only does not make nonsense of our attempts to interpret the period, but that it will go far to help explain some of the developments of the time.

If the writer is aware that the interpretation of the period is difficult, he is equally aware that he has little to offer that is new. There is probably not a single point made in the present paper that has not been made already by some scholar or other. Yet there may be something new in the bringing-together of material and in the interpretation based on it. At any rate, the subject treated is of extreme importance and often is given less attention than it deserves.

The question of the power and prestige of Sparta and the Peloponnesian League at the time is closely connected with the career of Cleomenes, a person as baffling and as interesting as Aristagoras himself. Probably the best account of Cleomenes available at present can be secured by combining the notices of his work given by Walker and Munro in the fourth volume of *The Cambridge Ancient History*.² There can be little doubt but that Cleomenes was the outstanding figure in

¹ Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (2d ed.), I, Part I, 401, n. 2; De Sanctis, *Atthis* (2d ed.), p. 332, n. 2.

² See particularly pp. 137 ff., 157 ff., and 259 ff. The writer is glad to acknowledge that his interest in Cleomenes and many other problems of Greek history first was aroused by the brilliant instruction of Mr. Walker. (*The Cambridge Ancient History* hereafter will be cited as *CAH*.)

the Peloponnesian history of the time, and that it was largely his work that gave to Sparta the undisputed leadership during the Persian War and to the Peloponnesian League the opportunity to become a Panhellenic organization. But his career was not one of uninterrupted success, and the appeal of Aristagoras came at a time when the prestige of Cleomenes, and with him that of Sparta, had suffered a setback from which it was not to recover before several years had passed. The loss of prestige was due to the humiliation suffered by Cleomenes when he attempted to interfere in the internal affairs of Athens¹ and to the failure of his subsequent plans for military intervention.² It is unlikely that either Cleomenes personally or Sparta regained the lost prestige before the decisive victory of Cleomenes over Argos in 494 B.C.³ In the meantime it seems that Cleomenes largely continued to be recognized as the real leader of Sparta. Thus it is reported that Aristagoras appealed to him personally, and the account of Herodotus of the war against Argos implies that it was more or less his war, though the report that he was brought to trial afterward before the ephors indicates that his leadership was not accepted universally. The situation may well have been such that to anyone looking at Greece from across the Aegean Sparta still was the outstanding power, and Cleomenes the most influential man in Greece. Nevertheless, the position of Sparta may well have been so shaken that if she had embarked on any adventurous foreign policy, she would have met with opposition even in the Peloponnesus.

It is well known that the failure of the attack of Cleomenes on Athens is reported to have been followed by a change in the Spartan constitution, namely, the adoption of the rule that only one king was to accompany the army on any particular expedition.⁴ It is tempting

¹ Herod. v. 72; Arist. *Ath. pol.* 20.

² Herod. v. 74-75.

³ Herod. vi. 76-83. The date 494 or approximately that year is accepted by Grote, IV, 430; Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, III, 319; Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, II (2d ed.), 561, n. 1; Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (2d ed.), II, Part I, 14, n. 1; Walker, *CAH*, IV, 164. On the other hand, Wells, *Studies in Herodotus* (Oxford, 1923), pp. 74 ff., argues for a date at the beginning of the reign of Cleomenes, as is suggested by Pausanias iii. 4. 1. The writer does not feel that he has succeeded in making 520 seem a more plausible date than 494, and is of the opinion that the best guide to the date is the double oracle reported by Herodotus (vi. 19, 77) which connects the battle with the fall of Miletus. This argument, of course, is not new.

⁴ Herod. v. 75.

to believe that the same event also led to a change in the relation of Sparta to her allies, a change so profound that it can be said to mark the beginning of the Peloponnesian League as a league and not as a mere conglomeration of allies. All students of Greek history are acquainted with the meetings of the assembly of the Peloponnesian League. It is also known that at some time or other the members of the League were bound by oath to abide by the decisions of the assembly.¹ Conversely it seems that Sparta was unable to demand the support of the allies for any project that had not been approved by the assembly of the allies.² It has been suggested that Sparta could call on the allies without consulting them in case of appeals for aid from a member of the League or in case of revolt,³ but even this is unlikely, at least for the period preceding the Peloponnesian War. When the two principles—that Sparta could demand the support of the allies only after consulting the League assembly and that the allies were bound to abide by the decisions of the assembly—were adopted, this amounted to the adoption of a constitution and the transformation of what had been merely a group of Spartan allies into the organization known to us as the Peloponnesian League. The change may have come gradually through practice and the later recognition of the usage that had been employed as binding, or it may have come all at once

¹ Thuc. v. 30 shows that the Corinthians had taken an oath to this effect. It is implied that other allies had done the same, and it is natural to believe that the oath was required from all members of the League.

² The principle that Sparta could not demand support for undertakings unless the project had been approved by the assembly does not seem to be formulated anywhere in the sources, but it seems safe to deduce it from the practice of consulting the assembly. The meetings reported include some at which the proposals of the Spartans were rejected (Herod. v. 91-93; Thuc. i. 40). Herod. v. 74-75 has been cited as an example of a case in which the allies refused to follow Sparta because the expedition in question "had not been decided on by a majority of the council" (Greenidge, *Greek Constitutional History*, p. 112). This incident, however, seems to belong to the period before the organization of the League as such.

³ Busolt, *Staatskunde*, pp. 1333-34 and 1334, n. 1. The examples cited of expeditions sent out in answer to appeals from allies hardly exclude consulting the League assembly even though meetings are not reported. The examples cited of actions against revolting cities all belong to the fourth century when Sparta was attempting to tighten her hold on the allies. On Herod. v. 74, also cited by Busolt, cf. the note immediately preceding this. Though members of the League are known to have carried on private wars (Kahrstedt, *Griechisches Staatsrecht*, I, 87 ff.), it is possible that they were pledged to defend each other against aggression. Yet it would be natural for the assembly to review the situation and decide whether the League was to act.

through something that resembled a constitutional convention in the manner in which the Second Athenian League and the Hellenic League of Philip II were organized. The oath of the allies already cited is enough to show that at any rate one of the principles involved was sworn to by the members of the League.

There are strong reasons for believing that the change belongs to the period now under consideration. When Cleomenes in 507 or 506 gathered the Peloponnesian army for the invasion of Attica, he did not announce the purpose of the expedition. The result was that when the objective became clear, the troops refused to follow, and his army broke up.¹ Some time later the Spartans are reported to have called a meeting of their allies (the assembly of the Peloponnesian League) and to have proposed to restore Hippias at Athens. The proposal was rejected first and foremost on account of the opposition of the Corinthians.² This is the first meeting of the kind reported in our sources, and there is reason to believe that it was the first regular meeting of the assembly of the Peloponnesian League.³ It is possible that there may have been earlier meetings that have not been recorded. Nevertheless, the contrast between the procedure at the time and the arbitrary action of Cleomenes shortly before makes it very likely that the practice of calling meetings of representatives of the allies is an innovation that dates from this time. Then too, as will be shown below, the general conditions of the time were such that an innovation of the kind would come very naturally, while there is no earlier date that suggests itself as an opportune moment for the change.

The usual belief that the Peloponnesian League grew out of a series of separate alliances between Sparta and various states is certainly correct. It is also obvious that Sparta, when she had succeeded in attaching to herself a strong group of allies, would attempt to develop a leadership of the kind that would enable her to use the combination for further extension of her power. This would necessarily lead to a demand that her allies should support her from time to time in aggressive wars. Since none of the old treaties is preserved, it is impossible

¹ Herod. v. 74-75.

² Herod. v. 91-93.

³ Grote (IV, 231 f.) treats this as the earliest assembly of the League. Walker (*CAH*, IV, 163) states: "It is undoubtedly the first recorded meeting of the League but we have no warrant for the assumption that it was the first meeting to be held."

to tell whether they were purely defensive alliances or whether they also provided for co-operation in offensive wars. Thus it is impossible to say whether or not Cleomenes acted within his rights when he simply called out allied troops and said nothing about the purpose of the expedition. If it was inevitable that Sparta should attempt to acquire a strong leadership over her allies, it was also inevitable that Greek cities in the long run should object to being deprived of all share in the direction of their own foreign policy. Thus nothing but a decided predominance of Sparta over her allies could prevent a clash. The clash, however, could not come, at least not a clash resulting in the organization of an assembly, before Sparta had attached to herself a sizable number of allies, and before she had begun an aggressive and far-reaching policy that would arouse the antagonism of her allies. It is clear that Sparta had been aggressive enough from the start but, except for her expedition against Polycrates of Samos,¹ she does not seem to have begun to operate outside the Peloponnesus before the reign of Cleomenes. Thus, for the first time Sparta was demanding that her allies send their armies abroad for what must have seemed a real foreign war. Under the circumstances it was natural both for Cleomenes to seek to secure the unquestioning support of the allies and for the allies to resist this demand. It is even likely that the abortive expedition of Cleomenes against Athens was the first expedition of this nature. The earlier expeditions in connection with the expulsion of Hippias seem to have been purely Spartan affairs.²

The development during the reign of Cleomenes would then be somewhat as follows: At the beginning of his reign Sparta was recognized as the outstanding power in Greece. She had a group of allies attached to herself by separate treaties, but no league existed. Cleomenes then attempted to gather an army from the various Peloponnesian allies and thus secure their co-operation under Spartan leadership in aggressive warfare outside the Peloponnesus—in this case, to be specific, against Athens. The allies refused to accept this sort of leadership, and soon the practice was adopted that such questions

¹ Herod. iii. 46-47, 54-56.

² The expedition against Polycrates was in no sense an undertaking of a league. Herodotus (iii. 47-48) speaks as though it were merely a Spartan undertaking in which the Corinthians were glad to co-operate. It is implied that this co-operation was purely voluntary.

were submitted by Sparta to an assembly of representatives of the allies. When this practice had become established and the decisions of the assembly were recognized as binding on the allies, the former loose group of Spartan allies had become transformed into the organization that we know as the Peloponnesian League.¹

According to the interpretation given above, the events of these few years form one of the turning-points in Greek history. The attempt of Cleomenes to call out the armed forces of the allies without giving any information concerning the objective of the expedition amounts to claiming for Sparta complete control over the foreign policy of the allies. If he had succeeded in making good this claim, Sparta might have secured for herself the kind of leadership that Rome later acquired over her Italian allies. In the light of the success of Rome, it is tempting to ask whether this system would have been equally successful in Greece and would have solved the problem of Greek unity. Such questions, however, are useless. The attempt of Cleomenes failed, and the result was not merely that the first Greek *symmachy*, known to us was organized, but that from that date to the time of Alexander the Great the efforts to secure unity in the Greek world were normally to take the form of the organization of *symmachies*, and that this institution was to continue to be a force to be reckoned with in Greek political life as late as the time of Antigonos Doson and Philip V. Probably the most striking proof of the greatness of Cleomenes is that he was able to accommodate himself to the new conditions and win for Sparta that prestige that was to give her the unchallenged leadership of Greece in the periods of Marathon and Salamis.

The first meeting of the assembly of the Peloponnesian League may have meant one of two things: Either it may have been a meeting called informally which simply set an example that was followed later until finally the assembly became a recognized institution; or else the first meeting may mean that something like a definite constitution for a league had been adopted. Though he is well aware that his view will seem somewhat startling, the writer is of the opinion that a definite constitution or constitutive law was adopted. In the absence of direct evidence on the point it is necessary to base one's opinion on

¹ The rise of the Peloponnesian League has been sketched on these lines by Grote (IV, 223 ff. and 230 ff.).

an analysis of conditions of the time and of Greek political procedure in general. Such analysis decidedly favors the theory of the adoption of something like a definite constitution.

To begin with the general background, the reader hardly needs to be reminded of how fond the Greeks were of attributing changes and innovations to lawmakers and reformers. If this is true of the earlier and more legendary period, it is equally true of the definitely historical period. Thus, the history of Athens indicates that the great constitutional changes were due to definite constitution-making and laws. It is enough to mention Solon, Cleisthenes, the reforms of the period between Marathon and Salamis, and the reforms of the period of Ephialtes and Pericles.¹ It is impossible to know the exact procedure by which the laws were adopted, but it is clear that laws embodying important constitutional changes were passed from time to time. This obviously is true also of Sparta, though in the case of the latter city it is more difficult to construct such a precise list of reforms and reformers. The procedure by means of which the constitution of a league was adopted would differ decidedly from that by means of which reforms were introduced into the constitutions of city-states. Nevertheless, there is no particular reason for believing that the Greeks were more careless about rules governing their *symmachies* than about the laws of their cities.

When we turn to the later *symmachies*, their example favors the belief in the adoption of constitutions. In the case of the Delian League, it is clear that its formation was preceded by discussion and that an agreement about its organization was reached at the outset.² In the case of the Second Athenian League it is even possible to trace to some extent the activities of what might almost be called a constitutional convention.³ The procedure is even more clear for Philip's Hellenic League, the so-called Corinthian League. If this was the pro-

¹ Wade-Gery in his interesting study, "Eupatridai, Archons, and Areopagus" (*Classical Quarterly*, XXV [1931], 1-11 and 77-89), connects a very definite constitutional reform and very precise constitution with the synoecism of Attica. If this is accepted, it will mean that it is possible to reconstruct a constitutional reform almost as far reaching as that of Solon at a date considerably earlier.

² For the present it will have to suffice to point to the interchange of oaths involved in the organization of the League (see Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 23. 5; Plut. *Arist.* 25).

³ Diod. xv. 28. 3-4. Cf. Marshall, *The Second Athenian Confederacy*, p. 14; Busolt, *Staatskunde*, p. 1366; Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, V, 380.

cedure of the other Greek *symmachies*, and if, as it is clear, the Peloponnesian League at some time acquired a constitution, why should one suppose that it alone failed to adopt its constitution formally at some definite time and instead believe that it just grew?¹

Finally, if we turn to the question of contemporary lawmaking and constitutional reform, the period is that of the reforms of Cleisthenes at Athens. Furthermore, as has been mentioned above, to this same period belongs an important change at Sparta, namely, the adoption of the rule that only one king was to accompany any particular army in the field. A period of activities of this nature certainly would be a suitable moment for experimentation in constitution-making also for a *symmachy*. It is most natural to suppose that at this time when the assembly of the Peloponnesian League first began to function rules determining its rights and the duties of the members were adopted. This would make the date of the real origin of the Peloponnesian League about 505 B.C.² Many probably will be skeptical on this point not only because they will think the evidence insufficient but also because they will feel that the theory presupposes too much formalism for such an early period. Skepticism of the latter kind is out of place in any student acquainted with the complications of Greek diplomacy and treaties revealed particularly by the inscriptions. It is true that few records of this kind have been preserved for the sixth century, but there is no reason for believing that the Greeks of the time were completely innocent of the arts practiced so assiduously a few years later.

It seems natural to suppose that the creation of the League was largely due to the influence of some of the allies who resented the type of leadership that Cleomenes had tried to exercise, but who realized that at times common action would be desirable. It is natural to attribute the initiative to the Corinthians, who played such an important part in the opposition to Cleomenes. For the adoption of the program it must have been necessary also to have Spartan co-operation. This must have been supplied by the opponents of Cleomenes. This opposition, probably under the leadership of the ephors, must

¹ The writer hopes at some later date to give a more full analysis of the problem of the form of constitution of the *symmachies*.

² Walker (*CAH*, IV, 163, n. 2) suggests 504 as an approximate date for the meeting at which the restoration of Hippias was proposed.

have been in the ascendancy temporarily.¹ To this party it is natural to attribute also the change introduced in the Spartan constitution at the time. It might be suggested that the proviso that only one king was to accompany any Spartan expeditionary force might be due to Cleomenes, who thus, when in the field, would be safe from any interference from Demaratus. This is highly unlikely. It would be impossible for any king to be certain that he and not the other king would be put in charge of any particular expedition. Furthermore, it would be unlikely that Cleomenes would be so shortsighted that, in order to gain an immediate advantage, he would father a measure that in the long run must tend to diminish the power of the kings in relation to the rest of the government. His method of getting rid of the opposition of Demaratus would rather have been the one he later adopted, to get rid of Demaratus and replace him with another king ready to co-operate with himself. The opponents of Cleomenes probably were responsible also for the proposal to restore Hippias at Athens.² Thus the opposition seems to have been responsible for a far-reaching program including a constitutional reform at Sparta, the organization of the Peloponnesian League, and a reversal of the foreign policy of Cleomenes. The rejection of the proposal to restore Hippias meant a failure of this new foreign policy and may have helped Cleomenes to regain speedily his leadership at Sparta. For the present, however, the failure of the Athenian policy of Sparta had undermined her prestige so completely that she was unable to exercise any positive leadership in the newly organized League. Apparently she was unable to exercise such leadership before her prestige was restored by the victory of Cleomenes over Argos.

To show how completely the policy of Sparta toward Athens had proved a fiasco, it may be well to review the policy briefly. The facts are well known, and only a few references to the sources and modern literature will be given. The Spartans at first seem to have been on terms of friendship with the Peisistratidae.³ To this period belongs

¹ Dickins (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXXII [1912], 30 f.) in his study, "The Growth of Spartan Policy" (*ibid.*, pp. 1-42), argues for opposition between Cleomenes and the ephors. In the article cited he makes much of opposition between kings and ephors throughout the entire course of Spartan history.

² Meyer (*Geschichte des Altertums*, II [1893], 799) and Walker (*CAH*, IV, 163) attribute the proposal to Cleomenes, but the latter is not mentioned in the account of Herodotus, and it seems much more natural to attribute the proposal to his opponents.

³ Herod. v. 63, 90; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 19. 4.

the famous incident in 519 of the appeal of the Plataeans to Cleomenes, who in turn referred them to Athens.¹ The appeal of the Plataeans bears witness to the outstanding position at the time of Sparta and of Cleomenes personally. At the time the position of Hippias may well have been so strong that it would have been foolish to invite his enmity. At a time when Megara apparently had become an ally of Sparta,² and when thus the territory of the allies of Sparta touched the Athenian boundary on one side, it would, no doubt, have seemed an unfriendly act to have acquired an ally on another side of Attica. It might have looked like an effort to insert a wedge between Athens and her powerful ally, Thessaly. In fact, fear of Thessaly may well have been the deciding motive.³ Later the opportunity of securing the co-operation of a powerful Athenian faction that already had attempted the forcible expulsion of Hippias⁴ seemed to make it possible for Sparta to adopt a much more ambitious policy and to attempt to bring Athens more directly within the sphere of Spartan influence. The fact that the first Spartan expedition was cut to pieces by Thessalian cavalry indicated that Athens and Thessaly still were dangerous,⁵ and showed that Cleomenes acted wisely when he refused to antagonize this combination by accepting Plataea as a direct ally.

¹ Herod. vi. 108 explains the action as due to a desire to embroil the Athenians with the Boeotians. It is strange that as able a historian as Grote, in his argument concerning the date of this event, placed a great deal of emphasis on this motive. One of his chief arguments for placing the event after 510 instead of in 519, as Thuc. iii. 68 implies, is that the desire to entangle the Athenians with the Boeotians would be natural after 510 but not in 519 when Hippias was "on terms of the closest intimacy with Sparta" (*History of Greece*, IV, 222, n. 1, sec. 3 on p. 223). It is even more strange to find that Wells, in refuting the argument of Grote, goes to great lengths to prove that such a motive would fit the conditions of 519 (*Studies in Herodotus*, pp. 84 f. and *passim*). It was, of course, as impossible for Herodotus as it is for us to know the real motives of Cleomenes. It is best just to note his act and to observe that it belongs to a period when Sparta and Athens at least outwardly were on good terms. It is not unlikely that it is an anachronism to attribute to this period a consideration of the danger of incurring the enmity of Boeotia. After all, at this time Athens found herself fully able to handle Boeotia. It was only later that Boeotia became a real power and a menace.

² There is no direct evidence which indicates just when Megara became a Spartan ally. It is commonly believed that the alliance had been consummated by this time. So Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, II (2d ed.), 396; Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, II (1893), 779; Adcock, *CAH*, IV, 73. It can hardly be denied that Megara must have become an ally before Sparta became involved in Attica and Boeotia. Dickins (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXXII [1912], 28) suggests that Cleomenes probably brought over Megara in 519, the year of the appeal of the Plataeans.

³ On this point cf. Adcock, *CAH*, IV, 78.

⁴ According to Herod. v. 62 and Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 19. 3 the Alcmaeonidae had attempted to use force before they began their intrigues at Delphi to secure Spartan action against the Peisistratidae.

⁵ Herod. v. 63; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 19. 5.

A second expedition led by Cleomenes in person was more successful.¹ The king is not mentioned in connection with the sending of the first Spartan force, but it is natural to conclude that he was the author of the policy. The impression made by the rest of his career is such that it is very unlikely that he allowed an oracle to bully him into an action of which he did not approve. When he intervened at Athens, it was because he chose to do so.² His aim scarcely can have been less than to make Athens the ally of Sparta subject to Spartan leadership. That such was his purpose seems borne out by his later interference in the internal affairs of Athens in order to keep a pro-Spartan party at the head of the state.³ It has already been mentioned that this interference led to the humiliation of Cleomenes, the first setback for the Spartan policy toward Athens. Obviously the newly liberated city was proving less tractable than the Spartans had hoped. Next came the effort of Cleomenes at armed intervention, which led to the second setback. Not only did Demaratus oppose his policy, but the Corinthians and other allies refused to follow, and thus the system of alliances built up by Sparta seemed crumbling. When Sparta again ventured to suggest new action against Athens, the restoration of Hippias, she summoned a meeting of the assembly of the Peloponnesian League and put her proposal before it, only to suffer a third setback. The allies failed to approve the policy proposed by Sparta. It was clear that a power that had been so humiliated could not count on a general support of the Peloponnesus for a venturesome foreign policy. Before Sparta could lead the Greeks against Persia, it was necessary to regain her prestige by some signal success. This had been accomplished by the time Athens appealed to Sparta against Aegina, and, as has been stated above, it probably was accomplished by means of the victory over Argos in 494. At any rate, before the year of Marathon, Sparta was once more the acknowledged leader of Greece.

The discussion of the relations of Sparta and Athens has shown that at the time of the visit of Aristagoras the Spartan leadership of Greece and even of the Peloponnesus had been shaken severely. It may be well to glance briefly also at the relations of Sparta to Corinth

¹ Herod. v. 64; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 19. 5-6.

² "But the influence of Sparta was powerful at Delphi and the oracle pointed her along the path she was inclined to go" (Adecock, *CAH*, IV, 81).

³ Herod. v. 70; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 20.

and Aegina, the two naval powers that De Sanctis suggests that Sparta might have led to the aid of the Ionians. To begin with Corinth, it is enough to call to mind that she had blocked Spartan action against Athens when Cleomenes attempted military intervention against the newly restored Athenian democracy, and again when the Spartans proposed to the assembly of the Peloponnesian League to restore Hippias. Whatever was the motive of the Corinthian leaders on this and other occasions, it is clear that the city was not ready to follow the leadership of Sparta unquestioningly. In fact, Corinth appears as a sort of leader of the opposition party within the League. Nor could Sparta rely much more confidently on the support of Aegina. When Cleomenes employed Aeginetan ships against Argos in 494, it appears that it was necessary to use compulsion.¹ It is also likely that the trade interests of Aegina made the city somewhat loath to get involved in a war with Persia. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the power of Argos was still unbroken, and that she was likely to make use of the opportunity if Sparta became involved in distant operations.²

When Aristagoras came to Sparta, the situation in the Peloponnesus was, therefore, such that it was impossible for Cleomenes to show whether he had vision enough to appreciate that the Ionian Revolt constituted a problem of interest to the entire Greek world and to recognize that concerted intervention might have been desirable and might have prevented the later invasion of Greece by Persian forces. It would not have been enough for him to make up his own mind or even to convince his fellow-Spartans. If the interpretation of the development of the Peloponnesian League suggested above is correct, the League *qua* league had recently been organized and had adopted the principle that Sparta could not demand the military co-operation of her allies without first securing the approval of the assembly of the League, and the one meeting of the period that has been recorded shows that the allies were quite capable of rejecting a measure advocated by Sparta. Thus, if Cleomenes had advocated the support of the Ionian Revolt, it is almost certain that this proposal would

¹ Herod. vi. 92. 1.

² In How and Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, II, 351, the Peloponnesian situation is cited as a reason explaining the refusal of Sparta to grant Aristagoras the aid requested.

have been voted down in the assembly of the League. It is likely that the leaders in the opposition to the proposal would have been Corinth and probably Aegina, the two cities whose support was indispensable if the intervention were to be successful. If mutual hostility had prevented these two cities from acting in concert, which is possible, Sparta would at best have received the support of one of them. If, on the other hand, Cleomenes had secured the approval of the assembly and had attempted intervention with the support, probably only half-hearted, of the allies, it is more than likely that Argos would have been able to stir up serious trouble for Sparta in the Peloponnesus.

It is rather useless to speculate concerning what Cleomenes would have done if the situation had been different. The writer is hardly inclined to agree that Sparta's earlier experience with distant enterprises was such as to make her disinclined to intervene.¹ In the case of the alliance with Croesus, Cyrus had acted so rapidly that they had had no opportunity to try their strength.² It can scarcely have been a surprise even to the Spartans that Cyrus paid no attention to their warning that he must keep his hands off Hellas.³ It is true that they had suffered a reverse at Samos, but this reverse seems due to the difficulties of siege-warfare rather than to the fact that it involved operations at a distance and the use of ships.⁴ Cleomenes himself on two occasions showed that he understood the advantages to be gained by the employment of ships in warfare in Greece. The first expedition against the Peisistratidae had been sent by sea.⁵ Again in 494 he employed ships in his campaign against Argos.⁶ Whether he would have undertaken distant operations by sea with a large armament is another question, and whether he would have considered intervention in the Ionian Revolt desirable still another. The only observation that it is possible to make at present is that, whatever the views and visions of individual leaders, the domestic conditions in Greece were such as to make Spartan intervention in the Ionian Revolt impossible.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ Cf., however, How and Wells, *loc. cit.*

³ Herod. i. 152-53.

² Herod. i. 83.

⁴ Herod. iii. 54-56.

⁵ Herod. v. 63; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 19. 5. Cf. above, p. 148.

⁶ Herod. vi. 76, 92.

LINE OMISSIONS IN HOMERIC PAPYRI SINCE 1925

BY BARBARA P. MCCARTHY

SINCE the publication of Professor Bolling's *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* in 1925, the following passages of the Homeric poems have been covered by the publication of vulgate papyri.¹

- A 1-8, 3 p. P. Reinach 2089. *Aeg.*, XI, 169 f.
- A 92-99, 3 p. P. Rainer. *Archiv für Bibliographie*, 1926, pp. 86 ff.; No. 1.
- A 94-112, 2 p. P. Iand. 346. *P. Iand.*, 1931, No. 73.
- A 223-45, 3 p. *PSI*, IX, 1083.
- A 258-78, 3 p. P. Col. 472. *AJP*, L, 255.
- A 343-60, 378-95, 3 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 2.
- A 479-84, 2 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 3.
- B 104-12, 3 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 4.
- B 188-202, 3 p. P. Col. 463 A. *AJP*, L, 256.
- B 738-41, 751, 753-54, 759, 765-93, 2 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 5.
- B 754-64, 798-801, 3 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 6.
- Δ 455-74, 476-84, 485, 505, 507-14, 6 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 7.
- E 529-36, 2 p. P. Reinach 2091. *Aeg.*, XI, 170 f.
- E 541-896, 2/3 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 8.
- E 857-78, 3 p. P. Col. 496. *AJP*, L, 386 f.
- Z 196-224, 236-76, 3 p. P. Osloens. 7. *Sym. Oslo.*, III, 20 ff.
- Z 216-28, 2 p. P. Col. 492B. *AJP*, L, 258.
- Z 322-38, 356-74, 386, 4/5 p. *PSI*, VIII, 977.
- H 223-37, 266-348, 2/3 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 9.
- Θ 216-32, 2/3 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 10.
- Θ 312-38, 2/3 p. *PSI*, VIII, 978.
- Θ 436-61, 1 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 11.
- I 152-61, 1/2 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 12.
- K 1-26, 1 a. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 13.
- Λ 152-62, 185-93, 5 p. P. Reinach 2101. *Aeg.*, XI, 171 f.
- Λ 449-55, 479-85, 1 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 14.
- Λ 708-21, 1 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 15.
- M 248-67, 2 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 16.

¹ Some of the Papyri Rainer catalogued by Dr. H. Gerstinger in the *Archiv für Bibliographie*, 1926, had already been published in rather inaccessible places; but since none of them were known to Professor Bolling, I include them all in this list.

- M 300-313 1/2 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 17.
 N 100-127 5 p. P. Bouriant 52. *Les Papyrus Bouriant*, p. 42, No. 5.
 N 355-81, 3 p. P. Reinach 2099. *Aeg.*, XI, 173 f.
 N 762-76, 2/3 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 18.
 Ξ 367-76, 3 p. P. Col. 414. *AJP*, L, 259 f.
 P 101-15, 2 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 19.
 P 104, 106-8, 110-11, 142-51, 2 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 20.
 T 121-33, 3 p. P. Rainer. *Ibid.*, No. 21.
 X 239-60, 2/3 p. P. Reinach 2090. *Aeg.*, XI, 174 f.
 X 449-74, 2/3 p. P. Mus. Br. 1545. Milne, *Catalogue*, 1927, No. 26.
 α 318-33, 344-59, and
 β 27-47, 53-73, 5 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 22.
 γ 178-86. *PSI*, IX, 1084.
 γ 179-90, 2 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 23.
 δ 87-105, 2/3 p. P. Reinach 2100. *Aeg.*, XI, 175 f.
 δ 483-91, 3/4 p. P. Osloens. 8. *Sym. Oslo.*, VI, 55 f.
 Θ 1-5. *PSI*, IX, 1085.
 ι 41-65, 94-101, 4 p. P. Reinach 2092. *Aeg.*, XI, 176 ff.
 ι 194-235, 2 p. P. Iand. 238. *P. Iand.*, 1931, No. 74.
 λ 145-209, 2/3 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 25.
 μ 31-57, 1/2 p. P. Iand. 347. *P. Iand.*, 1931, No. 75.
 μ 119-32, 152-65, 5 p. P. Rainer. *Op. cit.*, No. 26.
 ρ 331-55, 2 p. P. Col. 514. *AJP*, L, 387 ff.

Except for three obvious accidents, none of these papyri add any plus verses to the vulgate.

In the first section of *External Evidence*, Professor Bolling, applying certain general critical principles and the papyrus evidence when available, distinguished certain lines as interpolated into the Homeric poems after Aristarchus. Let us see whether the significant, that is non-accidental, omissions in these recently published papyri support his conclusions.

They confirm him in his rejection of A 265 (which already had two papyri as witnesses against it), B 798^a (previously known to occur in one papyrus and to be omitted in one), E 836^{ab} (already not found in one 2 p. papyrus), Θ 224-26, α 329^a, λ 178^{ab}, and μ 153^a (the first evidence on any of these lines).

Two lines, Θ 315 and Θ 458, which had been included by all editors were not rejected with finality by Professor Bolling but were questioned. Line 458 is omitted in several manuscripts, is not necessary to the sense, and is a στίχος διφορούμενος repeating Δ 21. Line 315

Professor Bolling questioned because of its omission in such trustworthy manuscripts as A G¹ in spite of its occurrence in 3/4 p. P. Berol. 7499. Of it he says, "The case must remain doubtful until other papyri are discovered."¹ Both of these lines are omitted by papyri in our list, 458 in 1 p. P. Rainer, No. 11, and 315 in 2/3 p. PSI, VIII, 978. Line 458 can now be rejected without question, and the question mark on the rejection of 315 should grow fainter if it is not removed completely.

H 234, which is another line questioned in *External Evidence*, is now covered for the first time by a papyrus. The accepted text agrees with one group of manuscripts in reading, *Αἶαν διογενὲς Τελαμώνιε, κοῖραν λαῶν*, which repeats I 644 and Δ 465. Papyrus Rainer No. 9 of the second or third century agrees with the other group of manuscripts in having *Αἶαν ἀμαρτῶν ἐς βογᾶϊε ποῖον ἔειπες*; which repeats N 824. From the occurrence of this variant in a papyrus, it seems likely that we have here two formulaic interpolations to introduce Hector's address to Ajax. Conservatism, however, would still dictate a question mark.

The only line rejected by Professor Bolling which occurs in papyrus published since 1925 is Δ 461 (=Z 11). This line appears in all the mediaeval manuscripts but was rejected because of its omission in two papyri, one of the first century B.C. and one of the third century A.D. The papyrus which now includes it is of the sixth century, so late that it weakens its rejection only slightly if at all. We may have here the interpolation in an early stage.

Of the lines which Professor Bolling does not question or reject, we find E 532 omitted in 2 p. P. Reinach 2091. It is a *στίχος διφορούμενος*, E 530-32 being equivalent to O 562-64, but there is no other evidence against the verse and it is almost essential to complete the idea of 531. "More of men that fear dishonor are safe than die" needs the complementary thought "But for those that flee there is neither glory nor safety." The editors A. Bataille and P. Collart say the line is "omis sans doute par mégarde parce qu'il est le dernier vers du discours." Possibly, but more likely there was a temptation to haplography in the fact that lines 531 and 532 begin with *αἰδομένων* and *φευγόντων*, which are of equal length and have the same ending.

¹ *AJP*, XXXVII, 20.

A 483, omitted in 2 p. P. Rainer No. 3, is a more serious omission. Like E 532, it is a *στίχος διφορούμενος* (=β 429 as 482=β 428). But, unlike E 532, it could be omitted without at all marring the sense of the passage, and there seems to be no technical reason for the omission. The *κατά* which occurs in both lines 483 and 484 gives the only possible reason for haplography; but since it does not occur in the same position in both lines, the temptation would be very slight. The verse should be questioned as possibly a successful interpolation.

A still more interesting omission is that of ι 55 by 4 p. P. Reinach 2092. Modern editors have frequently condemned the line, but have always coupled the preceding one (54) in their condemnation. Aside from aesthetic arguments, they have based their omission on the comment of a scholiast on line 54: *ἀναγκαίως καὶ τοῦτο ἵνα μὴ ἀπώλεια ἔτι ῥαδία γένηται τοῖς ἐκ μιᾶς νηὸς φεύγειν βουλομένοις*. From this scholion they have drawn the conclusion that lines 54 and 55 were suspected in antiquity—which lent weight to their own suspicions. But the scholiast does not mention 55. His comment is only on *τοῦτο*, the single line 54. And since his comment would be applicable to both lines if they had both been in his text and since line 54 could not be removed while 55 was allowed to stand, it is fair to assume that his copy of the poem like our papyrus included 54 and omitted 55. Line 54 may have been suspected in antiquity but it was in Aristarchus; 55 was not and should be added to Professor Bolling's list of interpolations after Aristarchus. The interpolation of the line from Σ 534 was natural after 54 which is partly equivalent to Σ 533. And the lateness of the archetype of our Odyssey manuscripts explains why the line is present in all of them.¹

This line and possibly A 483 are the only additions which these papyri make to the list of post-Aristarchus interpolations given in *External Evidence*. We must conclude then that Professor Bolling's principles for detecting interpolations are sound and that papyri discovered in the future will further confirm his judgment.

A fragment which is of interest though in itself it contains no line omissions is 5 p. P. Reinach 2089, containing on the verso A 152–62 and on the recto A 185–93. The leaf is sufficiently well preserved to show that there were 33 lines written on the verso; and since the pages

¹ Bolling, *External Evidence*, p. 13.

are numbered $\overline{\rho\pi\zeta}$ and $\rho\pi\varsigma$, the 185 preceding pages would have had 6,105 lines or line spaces. The vulgate up to A 152 has 6,421 verses, and so the editors who think the papyrus originally contained the complete text of the poem have to assume an average of almost two extra verses on each page—more if spaces were left between the books, as we should expect in a papyrus of this date. I should suggest that the papyrus when complete lacked the Catalogue of the Ships, B 494–877—lines which are omitted in one papyrus and twenty manuscripts. If we subtract from the number of lines in the vulgate these lines and the 30 verses which were certainly interpolated in the text, we get 6,007 verses as the number preceding our fragment. Subtract this from the 6,105 line spaces and we get 98 spaces, which would take care of breaks between the books, a heading of the poem, and any ornamental flourishes in which the fifth-century scribe may have indulged.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

POISONS AND POISONING AMONG THE ROMANS

BY DAVID B. KAUFMAN

POISONS and poisoning are frequently mentioned in Roman literature. The question whether the murder-rate and the percentage of suicides were greater than they are today is still debatable and cannot be decided with any degree of accuracy. Scholars cannot even agree on the size of the population of Rome itself at any given period, in spite of much research and many deductions. Much less can the death-rates from unnatural causes be determined. However, the crime of poisoning seems to have been much more frequent in ancient than in modern times. Perhaps this can be attributed to the absence of gunpowder and bullets.

The word *venenum* is derived, according to Walde,¹ from *Venus* and means a love potion. It has three meanings from actual usage: remedy,² poison,³ and magic drug or abortive.⁴ The exact meaning is frequently determined by the qualifying adjective *bonum* or *malum*.⁵ *Veneficium* means poisoning⁶ and practicing sorcery,⁷ while *veneficus* or *venefica* was applied to a poisoner⁸ or maker of drugs.⁹ However, in this paper we are primarily concerned with poisoning.

The first known instance of the crime of poisoning at Rome was in 331 B.C., when a high mortality, the result, probably, of a pestilence, was attributed to poisoning. Even Livy doubted the validity of the charges, but he¹⁰ gives the whole account as found in his sources. After many leading citizens had died from the same disease, a slave-girl gave information to the *curule aediles* that the reason for this high mortality was the poisons prepared and administered by the Roman matrons.

¹ A. Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*³ (Heidelberg: Winter, 1910), s.v.

² Pliny *NH* xxv. 128.

³ *Ibid.* 24.

⁴ Lucan vi. 681-84.

⁵ Cicero *Pro Cluentio* 14S; *Digest* l. 16. 236.

⁶ Pliny *op. cit.* xxviii. 47.

⁷ Cicero *Brutus* 217; Pliny *op. cit.* xviii. 41; xxviii. 59; Tacitus *Annales* iv. 22.

⁸ Quintilian vii. 8. 2; ix 2. 105.

⁹ Seneca *De beneficiis* v. 13. 4.

¹⁰ viii. 18; Valerius Maximus ii. 5. 3.

On investigation they found about twenty matrons, including patrician ladies, in the act of brewing poisons, which they declared were salutary. On being forced to drink their own concoctions to prove the charges false, they perished by their own wickedness. Following this, a hundred and seventy more were found guilty of the same offense. The second case of extensive poisoning is found in 186 B.C. in connection with the licentious worship of Bacchus.¹ After a careful and extensive investigation of four months, carried on throughout Italy, the praetor Quintus Naevius made a grand exposé resulting in the condemnation of two thousand persons. Poisoning was one of the crimes prominently mentioned with the rest.

Four years later, the ravages of a pestilence brought another investigation into cases of poisoning at Rome and throughout Italy.² A number of magistrates, including a consul, and many illustrious men of all ranks had died. The praetors were charged, by order of the senate, to investigate the rumors. Hostilia, the wife of the consul, was suspected of having plotted this outrage, to elevate a son by a former marriage to the consulship. She was condemned on circumstantial evidence, and, with her, three thousand were put to death. We see that women were most addicted to poisoning, but it seems not improbable that this charge was frequently brought against them without sufficient evidence of their guilt, like that of witchcraft in Europe in the Middle Ages. They were condemned to death for this crime in seasons of pestilence, when the popular mind is always in an excited state and ready to attribute the calamities which they suffer to the arts of evil-disposed persons. We should remember also that the complete lack of chemical analysis made the charge of poisoning impossible of testing. On the other hand, they had a different code of morals and one less rigid than our own, which together with the fact that the relative size of their criminal class was possibly comparable with our own lends validity to the frequency of the charges of poisoning.

In 154 B.C. two former consuls were poisoned by their wives.³ Cases of poisoning seem to have multiplied rapidly from this time forth.⁴ In Quintilian's⁵ day the word "adulteress" was considered

¹ Livy xxxix. 8-19 and 41.

⁴ Plutarch *Cato Major* ix. 7.

² *Ibid.* xl. 37 and 43.

⁵ v. 11. 39.

³ Livy *Epitoma* 48.

synonymous with that of "poisoner," but even two centuries earlier Marcus Cato asserted that every adulteress was a poisoner. Cicero¹ mentioned some *venefici* among Catiline's friends. Catiline was also accused of having poisoned his son because Aurelia Orestilla hesitated to marry him as long as a stepson stood in the way.² In the *Philippics*³ Cicero alludes to a friend of Antony, who had given his nephew poison. Wife-poisoning seems to have been common.⁴ Cicero had several cases dealing with persons accused of having administered such drugs.⁵ The speech in behalf of Cluentius supplies us with a number of details on the subject. The younger Oppianicus accused Cluentius of poisoning, but Cicero's speech was mainly concerned with the earlier prosecution by Cluentius of the father of the present prosecutor, and in it he made some startling disclosures showing that the elder Oppianicus was really a villain and a poisoner. His victims were his own wife, Cluentia,⁶ his brother's wife, Auria, killed in pregnancy to prevent her bearing a child who would bar his inheritance of his brother's property,⁷ and his brother.⁸ This same man, through intermediaries, tried to bribe the slave of the physician attending Cluentius to poison him.⁹ Cicero, in this speech, also mentions, by way of parallel, the case of a certain woman of Miletus, who in pregnancy had accepted a bribe from the alternative heirs and procured her own abortion by drugs.¹⁰

In the early Empire, this crime must have been very frequent at Rome among all classes of society, to procure an inheritance,¹¹ to eliminate a husband¹² or stepson,¹³ or to rid one of his enemies,¹⁴ all of which was lamented by Juvenal and Tacitus and their contemporaries. Juvenal¹⁵ adds: "If you want to be anybody nowadays, you must dare

¹ *In Catilinam* ii. 4. 7.

² Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 15; Valerius Maximus ix. 1. 9.

³ xi. 6. 13.

⁴ Pliny *op. cit.* xxvii. 4; Martial iv. 69.

⁵ *Pro Coelio* xiii. 30; *Pro Cluentio* 10.

⁶ 30.

⁷ 31.

⁸ 31.

⁹ 47.

¹⁰ 32.

¹¹ Seneca *Epistulae* cxix. 6; Juvenal i. 158; xiv. 173 and 250.

¹² Seneca *Epistulae* cxix. 6; Martial iv. 69; Juvenal i. 69-70.

¹³ Juvenal vi. 133-34 and 628.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* xiii. 25.

¹⁵ i. 73-76 (Loeb trans.).

some crime that merits narrow Gyara or a gaol; honesty is praised and starves. It is to their crimes that men owe their pleasure-grounds and high commands, their fine tables and old silver goblets with goats standing out in relief." We learn, from the same author, of mothers deliberately poisoning their own children, for no particular reason, and even showing defiance when apprehended.¹ The most deplorable thing of all is the fact that the women, supposedly the weaker sex, killed for hire.² Of course, among the male sex professional killers were common.³ Juvenal⁴ mentions the case of a woman who stabbed her husband, after poisons proved ineffective, since the husband, anticipating her attempt, had secured himself against poison by prophylactics. Juvenal⁵ also advises a father to take an antidote before dinner because his son is praying for his death which has been postponed so long. Nonius Asprenas, a close friend of Augustus, was accused of poisoning one hundred and thirty guests.⁶

Poison played a prominent part at the imperial court. Tiberius' son, Drusus, was reported to have been poisoned by his wife and Sejanus,⁷ and Claudius by his wife Agrippina.⁸ In the reign of Tiberius, Piso was accused of killing Germanicus with poison.⁹ Agrippina, wife of Germanicus, even feared to taste any fruit which Tiberius handed her at dinner.¹⁰ Murder in the same fashion was committed or attempted by the following emperors: Caligula,¹¹ Nero,¹² Vitellius,¹³ Domitian,¹⁴ Commodus,¹⁵ Caracalla,¹⁶ and Elagabalus.¹⁷ Caligula left a large trunk full of poisons.¹⁸ Suetonius informs us that Nero, the arch-poisoner, ordered that Britannicus, Claudius' son, be poisoned;

¹ Juvenal vi. 638-42.

⁴ vi. 659-61.

² *Ibid.* 646.

⁵ xiv. 250-54.

³ *Ibid.* xiii. 25.

⁶ Pliny *op. cit.* xxxv. 164; Suetonius *Augustus* 56.

⁷ Tacitus *Annales* iv. 8; Suetonius *Tiberius* 62; Dio Cassius lvii. 22.

⁸ Juvenal vi. 620; Tacitus *Annales* xii. 66-67; Suetonius *Claudius* 44; Nero 33.

⁹ Tacitus *Annales* ii. 69-74; iii. 12-15.

¹⁰ Suetonius *Tiberius* 53.

¹¹ Dio Cassius lix. 14.

¹² Tacitus *Annales* xiv. 3 and 65; xv. 60; Suetonius *Nero* 34; Dio Cassius lxiv. 2-3.

¹³ Suetonius 14.

¹⁶ Spartianus *Caracalla* 3.

¹⁴ Tacitus *Agricola* 43.

¹⁷ Lampridius *Heliogabalus* 13.

¹⁵ Lampridius *Commodus* 9.

¹⁸ Suetonius 49.

thrice he attempted the life of his mother, Agrippina, but found her fortified by antidotes; his aunt, Domitia, he did poison for her estate; according to the same author, he sent poison to Burrus, praetorian prefect, in place of throat medicine which he had promised him; the children of Piso's confederates, and Nero's own freedmen who had aided him to the throne, were included among the Emperor's poisoned victims.¹ He even planned to poison the entire senate at banquets.²

Poisoning became so common that those who were in enviable positions of wealth and influence could not take any food or drink with definite assurance of safety. Consequently, tasters, *praegustatores*, who were slaves or freedmen, were secured for the emperors' tables.³ In fact, they became so common that they formed a *collegium* with a *procurator praegustatorum*.⁴ According to one account, Claudius was poisoned by his *praegustator*, the eunuch Halotus.⁵ Pliny⁶ tells us that, before the battle of Actium, Antony distrusted Cleopatra to such an extent that he refused to touch any food set before him unless another person had tasted it first. Students even took to writing compositions on "The Poisoner."⁷ Adgandestrius, chief of the Chatti, sent a note to the Roman senate, promising the death of Arminius, if poison were sent from Rome for the perpetration of the crime.⁸

Poison was also commonly employed throughout Roman times for suicidal purposes. Livy⁹ tells us that, before the surrender of Capua to the Romans, twenty-seven Campanian senators took poison to save their bodies from torture, their minds from insult, their eyes and ears from the sight and hearing of all the cruelties and indignities that await the conquered. When Masinissa found himself in difficulty with the Romans for having married Sophonisba, the wife of the conquered chieftain, Syphax, he sent her a cup of poison which he requested her to take in order that she might not fall into the hands of the Romans.

¹ *Ibid.* 33-36.

² *Ibid.* 43.

³ Tacitus *Annales* xii. 66; *CIL*, VI, 602, 1956.

⁴ *CIL*, VI, 602, 1956, 5355, 9003-5.

⁵ Suetonius 44.

⁶ *Op. cit.* xxi. 12.

⁷ Quintilian *Declamatio* xvii. 11; Juvenal vii. 169.

⁸ Tacitus *Annales* ii. 88.

⁹ xxvi. 13-14.

Livy¹ adds that it was the custom of kings to keep poison in stock, against the uncertainties of fortune. Hadrian compelled Servianus to kill himself, on the ground that he aspired to the throne.² Pliny³ says that many persons have ended their lives with poison, especially if an incurable malady has rendered existence intolerable. The most excruciating pains, according to this author,⁴ are those attendant upon strangury, those arising from maladies of the stomach, and those caused by disorders of the head; it was more generally in these cases that patients were tempted to commit suicide. Elagabalus had poisons at hand with which to kill himself, if need arose, since it had been prophesied that he would die a violent death.⁵

Tacitus gives us numerous instances of prisoners or accused taking or being administered poison. When Martina, a notorious dealer in poisons, was held under suspicion for the murder of Germanicus and sent to Rome, she died suddenly, supposedly of poison taken to avoid any disclosures.⁶ When Vibulenus Agrippa was tried before the senate, in the reign of Tiberius, he swallowed poison which he had concealed under his robe, and instantly expired.⁷ When Seneca, after opening his veins, found death slow, he requested a friend to give him poison that was usually given, at Athens, to the criminals condemned to die.⁸

Let us turn our attention to the poisons and their effects. Possibly the most familiar is hemlock (*cicuta*).⁹ Lucretius¹⁰ makes a statement that goats often fatten on hemlock which for man is rank poison. Pliny¹¹ says it is a plant whose seed is noxious, while the stalk is eaten by many people, either green or cooked. Its stem is smooth, often as much as three feet in height, and branching at the top. The leaves have a strong odor; the root is never used; the seeds and leaves possess refrigerating properties which are so fatal because they coagulate the blood. In diluted form it has beneficial qualities. The best antidote, provided it has not reached the bowels, is wine, says our author; but if it is taken in wine, it is irremediably fatal. The bodies of those

¹ xxx. 14-15.

² Spartianus *Hadrianus* 23.

³ *Op. cit.* xx. 199.

⁴ *Ibid.* xxv. 23.

⁹ Horace *Satires* ii. 1. 56; *Epistulae* i. 2. 53.

¹⁰ v. 897.

⁵ Lampridius *Heliogabalus* 33.

⁶ *Annales* iii. 7.

⁷ *Ibid.* vi. 40.

⁸ *Ibid.* xv. 64.

¹¹ *Op. cit.* xxv. 151-54.

poisoned by it are covered with spots. Hemlock was grown at Susa in Assyria, in Parthia, Laconia, Crete, Megara, and Attica.

Another poison was henbane (*hyoscyamos*),¹ found in four varieties. The oil extracted from the seed caused insanity, if injected into the ears, and, according to Pliny, even the leaves exercised a deleterious effect upon the mind. This plant was found in maritime regions. Aconite (*aconitum*) was commonly used at Rome.² It was the most prompt of all poisons in its effects.³ Aconite has leaves like a cucumber, never more than four; they are hairy and rise from near the root. It grew on bare rocks, especially in Pontus. Its odor kills mice at a considerable distance, so we are told. On the other hand, aconite is a useful ingredient, in composition, for the eyes, and, taken in mulled wine, neutralizes the venom of the scorpion. The ancients inform us that the hellebore (*elleborum* or *veratrum*),⁴ especially the black variety, kills animals but was much used by man as a purgative, a remedy for mental diseases, epilepsy, etc. It was found on high mountains. Pliny says that people who gather it should eat garlic and drink wine to avoid ill effects. Some famous men like Carneades and Chrysippus used it to sharpen their intellectual powers.

Pliny⁵ warns against mushrooms because the poisonous cannot always be distinguished from the non-poisonous. He asserts that any become noxious if they grow near a hobnail, a piece of rusty iron, a bit of rotten cloth, or a hole of a serpent, or if they are breathed upon by a serpent. Their medicinal uses, in his day, were for stomach ailments, freckles, and spots on women's faces, maladies of the eyes, ulcers, eruptions, and bites. Opium, made from the juice of the white poppy, was known to the Romans and was used by them in large doses for suicidal purposes. Small quantities were said to cause blindness, but, if mixed with other materials, it was considered beneficial for headache, earache, gout, and erysipelas.⁶ Thapsia⁷ was very poisonous but little used. It was so noxious that those who gathered the plant waxed their faces. The berries of the yew tree (*taxus*)⁸ were considered poisonous, and even the wood was thought to be so noxious

¹ *Ibid.* xxv. 35-37.

² Juvenal i. 158; viii. 219.

³ Pliny *op. cit.* xxvii. 4-10.

⁴ *Ibid.* xxv. 47-61.

⁵ *Ibid.* xxii. 92-99.

⁶ *Ibid.* xx. 198-203.

⁷ *Ibid.* xiii. 124-26.

⁸ *Ibid.* xvi. 50-51.

that it killed those who drank from vessels carved from it. Pliny adds that anyone who sleeps beneath a yew tree, or only takes food there, is sure to meet his death. Arrows may have been dipped into its juice to give them a poisonous coat. The same author claims that these poisonous qualities are entirely neutralized by driving a copper nail into the wood of the tree.

One of the varieties of nightshade (*strychnos* or *trychnos*)¹ was supposed to cause insanity if only a few drops were taken, and instant death from larger quantities. Weapons that were used in battle were poisoned with it. The Greeks maintained that it was productive of delusive and prurient fancies and of vain, fantastic visions. Its antidote was mulled wine. When placed near an asp, it was said to cause torpor in the serpent. It is to be noted that all the poisons which have been mentioned so far are vegetable products.

The Spanish fly (*cantharis*) was poisonous, we are told, when taken internally, causing excruciating pain in the bladder, but, applied externally, was beneficial.² *Buprestis*³ was an insect rarely found in Italy. When eaten by cattle, it was reputed to cause such expansion of the gall that the animal burst asunder, but was beneficial to man, when employed externally. A nitrate (*nitrum*) was used as an emetic, in cases where *buprestis* had been swallowed, and as an antidote against bull's blood.⁴ The scorpion⁵ is also mentioned. We are told that a slice of toad's (*rubeta*) lung or its blood caused death.⁶ Pliny⁷ mentions several sea fish which are considered poisonous: *lepus*, *araneus*, and *trygon*. Several species of venomous reptiles were known in antiquity: *vipera*,⁸ *aspis*,⁹ and *dipsas*.¹⁰ The salamander was considered the most venomous reptile and able to wipe out whole nations at one time. If it crawls up a tree, says Pliny,¹¹ it infects all the fruit and kills those who eat thereof. If it only touches with its foot the wood upon which bread is baked, or falls into a well, the same fatal effects ensue. If its saliva touches any part of the body, the hair falls

¹ *Ibid.* xxi. 177-82.

² *Ibid.* xxix. 93-96.

³ *Ibid.* xxx. 30.

⁴ *Ibid.* xxxi. 119-20.

⁵ *Ibid.* xi. 163-64; xxviii. 24.

⁶ Juvenal i. 70; vi. 659.

⁷ *Op. cit.* ix. 155.

⁸ Suetonius *Claudius* 16.

⁹ Lucan ix. 610-14.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Op. cit.* xxix. 74-86.

off from the entire body. Bull's blood, taken fresh, was ranked as a poison, while that of a he-goat was considered so powerful that it was preferred above everything else for sharpening iron implements, if we can believe Pliny.¹ Viper's blood was also listed as a poison.²

Mineral poisons were relatively unknown to the Romans although they knew of the deleterious effect of gypsum (*gypsum*), white lead (*cerussa*), sulphur or sulphates (*sulphur*), and quicksilver (*argentum vivum*).³ The waters of several fountains in Thessaly, Arcadia, and Macedonia were fatal.⁴ According to one account, Alexander the Great perished from water secured from a spring in Macedonia which was well known for its poisonous properties.⁵ On the other hand, some wells were deliberately poisoned.⁶ Venomous substances of myth and fable could be cited but shall not be treated of here; some of the poisons listed above may probably come under the same category.

Poisons were administered in a number of ways. The easiest was to mix them in the wine which one drank.⁷ Concealing them in food was another means: Juvenal⁸ mentions the danger of eating hot cakes; Agrippina was supposed to have served Claudius with a drug in his mushrooms;⁹ Commodus murdered the praetorian prefect with figs treated with poison.¹⁰ Cicero¹¹ says it was difficult and unusual to administer poison in bread, and in such a combination the poison did not take effect as quickly as when mixed in wine, although detection was easier. Dio¹² mentions a very ingenious device. He says many persons died without knowing the cause, murdered by someone who pricked them with needles smeared with poison. Horace¹³ mentions mixing hemlock with honey. Perhaps the most ingenious method was that used by Cleopatra.¹⁴ When Antony became very suspicious of her before the battle of Actium, she dipped the tips of the flowers of her chaplet into poison and during the banquet dropped the chaplet into

¹ *Ibid.* xi. 221-23; xxviii. 147-48.

² Horace *Epodes* iii. 6.

³ Pliny *op. cit.* xxviii. 129.

⁴ Q. Curtius Rufus x. 10; Seneca *Naturales quaestiones* iii. 25. 1-2; Pliny *op. cit.* ii. 231; Plutarch *Alexander* 77.

⁵ Q. Curtius Rufus x. 10.

¹⁰ Lampridius *Commodus* 9.

⁶ Seneca *De Ira* ii. 9. 3.

¹¹ *Pro Cluentio* 173.

⁷ Juvenal i. 69-70; vi. 633.

¹² *lxxvii.* 11. 6.

⁸ *vi.* 631.

¹³ *Satires* ii. 1. 56.

⁹ Suetonius 44.

¹⁴ Pliny *op. cit.* xxi. 12.

the wine which he was about to drink, thus showing how adept she was in poisoning.

A number of antidotes¹ were known: asses' milk for mineral poisoning, cows' milk for hemlock, any kind of milk for *cantharides*, *buprestis*, and the salamander. Wine was the best general remedy² for vegetable poisoning, and for bites and stings. Some poisons were slow in acting,³ others rapid;⁴ some caused one to become speechless until death ensued.⁵ Some bodies became black or livid after death.⁶ Dio⁷ tells the story of how Nero had the body of Germanicus whitened with gypsum, after it had turned black from the poison administered by him. But it as was being carried through the Forum, a heavy rain which fell while the gypsum was still moist washed it off, so that the crime was known to everyone.

A number of persons were well versed in poisons. Attalus III occupied his spare moments with raising poisonous plants and studying their characteristics.⁸ Mithradates had done a great deal on the subject of antidotes⁹ and was always prepared against poisoning by taking prophylactics.¹⁰ A number of women who excelled in the art gained great notoriety and had their hands in many murders: among them were Canidia,¹¹ Locusta,¹² and Martina.¹³ Some gained great wealth, and Nero even placed pupils under Locusta to be instructed in the art, after she had been so successful in eliminating Britannicus.¹⁴ This same woman had been condemned to death but was saved to serve the leaders of state in their murderous practices.¹⁵ After Apollodorus, a rhetorician of Pergamus, was convicted of being a poisoner, he went to Massilia and opened a school there. He had been defended by Asinius Pollio in one of the three trials for poisoning under Augustus, in all of which Pollio served as defense counsel.¹⁶ We know of physicians who

¹ *Ibid.* xxviii. 128-29.

⁷ *lxi.* 7. 4.

² *Ibid.* xxiii. 43.

⁸ Plutarch *Demetrius* xx. 2.

³ Suetonius *Claudius* 44.

⁹ Pliny *op. cit.* xxv. 62-63.

⁴ Pliny *op. cit.* xxi. 12.

¹⁰ Juvenal vi. 661.

⁵ Suetonius *Claudius* 44.

¹¹ Horace *Epodes* iii. 8.

⁶ Juvenal i. 72.

¹² Juvenal i. 71; Tacitus *Annales* xii. 66; Suetonius *Nero* 33.

¹³ Tacitus *Annales* ii. 74; iii. 7.

¹⁴ Suetonius *Nero* 33.

¹⁵ Tacitus *Annales* xii. 66; xiii. 15; Suetonius *Nero* 33.

¹⁶ Seneca *Controversia* ii. 13. 13; Porphyrio *Horati epistulae* i. 5. 9.

practiced this art and became notorious through it.¹ By the oath of Hippocrates, physicians swore never to administer a poison to anyone when asked to do so, or to suggest such a course, or to give an abortive. The disdain in which poisoners were held is evidenced by the fact that the word *veneficus* or *venefica* was an insult.²

Let us look at the legal side of the question and see the penalties meted out. As early as the time of the Twelve Tables special disposition was made of cases involving murder by poison.³ Polybius⁴ gives evidence of the seriousness of the crime by classing it with treason, conspiracy, and assassination, all of which, he says, are under the jurisdiction of the senate. The first legislative enactment especially directed against poisoning was a law of the dictator Sulla, *Lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis*, passed in 82 B.C., which continued in force, with some alterations, to the latest times.⁵ It struck not only at the poisoner but also at those who prepared, sold, possessed, or bought poison for effecting the death of someone. By a *senatusconsultum* passed subsequently, a female who gave drugs or poison for the purpose of removing sterility, even without any evil intent, was banished, if the person to whom she administered them died in consequence.⁶ Another *senatusconsultum* brought druggists (*pigmentarii*) under the same limitations, and made them liable to the penalties of this law, if they administered love-philtres.⁷ From the *Digest* we learn that the punishment fixed by this law was the *deportatio in insulam* and the confiscation of property for those of higher station (*altiores*); those of lower rank (*humiliores*) were thrown to the wild beasts.⁸ We have no definite information about the penalty imposed in the time of the Republic, but it probably was the *interdictio aquae et ignis*, since the *deportatio* under the emperors took the place of the *interdictio*, and the expression in the *Digest* was suited to the time of the compilers.

Let me conclude by quoting Pliny:

. . . It is out of compassion to us that she (the earth) has ordained certain substances to be poisonous, in order that when we are weary of life, hunger, a mode of death the most foreign to the kind disposition of the earth,

¹ Apuleius *Metamorphosis* x. 11 and 25-26.

² Plautus *Truculentus* 762.

³ *Digest* l. 16. 236.

⁴ vi. 13. 4.

⁵ Cicero *Pro Cluentio* 148; *Digest* xlviii. 8. 3.

⁶ *Digest* xlviii. 8. 3. 2.

⁷ *Ibid.* 3.

⁸ *Ibid.* 5.

might not consume us by a slow decay, that precipices might not lacerate our mangled bodies, that the unseemly punishment of the halter may not torture us, by stopping the breath of one who seeks his own destruction, or that we may not seek our death in the ocean, and become food for our graves, or that our bodies may not be gashed by steel. On this account it is that nature has produced a substance which is very easily taken, and by which life is extinguished, the body remaining undefiled and retaining all its blood, and only causing a degree of thirst. And when it is destroyed by this means, neither bird nor beast will touch the body, but he who has perished by his own hands is reserved for the earth.¹

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE
EASTON, PA.

¹ *Op. cit.* (Bohn trans.) ii. 156.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

VERGILIANA

The work of Varius, in editing the first edition of the *Aeneid* from Vergil's manuscript, is characterized in the *Vita Donatiana* by the phrase *summatim emendare*. Other *vitae* give it more definition: the editor, under orders from Augustus, removed *superflua* but made no additions. There was nothing Peerlkampian about the performance—no attempt to give what Vergil could have said or ought to have said. But the provision that *superflua* could be removed opened a loophole to violent treatment in case the editor should fail in proper *pietas*.

As evidence of the latitude which Varius allowed himself in this respect we have four well-known instances—one of them not certain—in which omissions were made:

1. At the beginning of the poem, where four lines were removed [*Vita Donatiana* 163 ff. (Brummer); *Vita Serviana* 32 ff.].
2. A passage of twenty-two lines, now numbered ii. 567–88—the famous Helen episode [*Vita Serv.* 39 ff.].
3. Four lines after vi. 289, describing the Gorgon [Serv. *ad loc.*].
4. Three lines after iii. 204, referring to Malea [*ibid.*]. This passage may well have been omitted by the first editor, though Servius does not say so.

Are these all the omissions? We cannot be sure. Clearly Varius could not keep the omissions secret; there had been too much recitation of the poem. He must either have allowed those interested to copy the omitted verses from Vergil's manuscript, or given out copies himself. Hyginus, for example, could have had these verses. His method of handling the text of the *Georgics* (Gell. i. 21. 2) shows that he tried to get back to the author's own copy; and when he declares that Vergil left the reading *limo* (not *lino*) in *Aen.* xii. 120 (Serv. *ad loc.*), I am inclined to think he had access to Vergil's manuscript. That he noted in his *Commentarii* the omissions of the first editor would not be an unreasonable guess. The use of Vergil's manuscript is more directly attested in the case of Probus (Gell. xiii. 21. 4). Matters of text were of prime importance to him; and we should expect that the *superflua* omitted from the *editio princeps* would appear in the notes to his famous edition of Vergil's works. To suppose that these passages came down through this channel is safer than to conclude with Ribbeck (*Prolegomena*, pp. 90 ff.) that they were composed by interpolators. The internal evidence adduced against their genuineness by either Ribbeck or others is thoroughly feeble.

Probus' commentary was consulted by Gellius (xv. 30. 5). Priscian used Probus *De duobus generibus* (ii. 171. 14 [Keil]), and we have no reason to suppose his Vergil was not accessible. There is a reasonable chance that in

Servius' time a real scholar could have got all the omissions. To assume that Servius did so is a different matter. When, in his life of Vergil, he gives the initial four verses and the Helen passage merely as examples of Varius' omissions (l. 32), we wonder if the complete list could have amounted to four only. On the other hand, when he mentions in his commentary the Gorgon passage and the Malea passage, which involve so little, we suspect he may have been on the lookout for just such passages. This is as far as we can get with Servius. Nevertheless, the fact remains that other omissions are not mentioned by anybody. Probably there was not much else. In this respect, as in others, the editorial work of Varius seems to have been a thoroughly conservative job.

There are then three well-attested *superflua*. But the curious thing is that editors treat all three differently. The initial four lines are generally not printed in the text but appear in the *apparatus criticus*; the Helen passage is printed in the text, sometimes bracketed, sometimes not; the Gorgon passage is neglected except in the largest editions. And yet all these passages really stand on the same footing.

The job of the textual critic of the *Aeneid* is peculiar. For most pieces of ancient literature the critic's duty is to get back as far as possible to what the author meant to say. But Vergil did not mean to say anything; he was not ready to have the poem published. The most a critic of the *Aeneid* can imagine as his duty is to try for what Vergil would have said—that is, if he had lived and been compelled to publish the poem himself at the time it was published. How can a modern scholar do a thing like that? Certainly not by trying to recover what was in Vergil's manuscript, for Vergil would have made changes, and we cannot tell what changes. Nobody expects to find out what shape the manuscript was in—how much the margin was used, how much was written between the lines, what means there were of indicating passages Vergil was dissatisfied with, wanted to emend, or intended to omit entirely. Varius, however, not only had this manuscript, but as Vergil's intimate friend, who had talked the poem over with him, he may well have known how Vergil felt about some things not actually marked in the manuscript. Of course nobody supposes that we can ever recover thoroughly what Vergil would have said, but we can get nearest to it by undertaking to reproduce Varius' text. That text, and not the manuscript of Vergil, should be clearly kept in mind as the aim of modern criticism. If Varius omitted a passage, who are we to put it back again?

None of the three passages in question is really required by the context—in spite of what some critics have claimed about the Helen passage. None of the passages was in the editions used by Servius and Tiberius Claudius Donatus for their commentaries. Nor is any of them in the early manuscripts. They should be treated alike—kept out of the text and printed in the *apparatus*.

In Book ii this will leave a somewhat unpleasing connection between lines 566 and 589, which will then stand next each other, but this imperfection will be no worse than the hundred other imperfections—mostly minor and scarce-

ly noticeable—that the poem now contains. *Dolor* and *iras* (l. 594) then refer to Aeneas' feelings about the whole situation at Troy. *Tyndaridis facies* (l. 601) does not require the actual presence of Helen any more than *culpatus Paris* (l. 602) requires the presence of Paris. The Helen passage should not be given to students and general readers as part of the *Aeneid*.

In *Aen.* i. 2 the reading *Laviniaque* has persisted too long. The old manuscripts are divided between *Laviniaque* and *Lavinaque*; but the testimonia are unusually numerous and overwhelmingly for *Lavinaque*. How Norden (note on *Aen.* vi. 33) can feel that the manuscript evidence is strong enough to outweigh that of the testimonia, it is hard to see. In the only other passage where Vergil uses the adjective (*ibid.* iv. 226), he has it, to be sure, in the form *Lavinius*. Still, *Lavinus* was in use, and we had better make Vergil spell it two ways than run counter to an ancient tradition so strong. Birt (*Kritik und Hermeneutik*, pp. 38 f.) has almost said the last word on the subject. Some emphasis might be given, however, to Vergil's general inconsistency in spelling, brought out by Probus in Gell. xiii. 21. 3, and distinctly recognized in Sabbadini's new text (1930). If Sabbadini had made more allowance for it in *Aen.* i. 2, it would have been well. Another very recent edition, Mackail's, properly reads *Lavinaque*.

On *Aen.* i. 3 Henry says (*Aeneidea* I, 133):

The direct thread of discourse is dropped at *litora*, is taken up again at *genus unde* (6), after a parenthetic reference (*multum-Latio*) to the difficulties encountered by the hero between his leaving Troy and the establishing himself in Italy, and the nature and origin of those difficulties. That such is the structure were best indicated by two dashes, one placed before *multum*, and the other after *Latio*.

This is substantially the "structure" Servius suggests in his comment on the passage. None of the leading editors, except Hirtzel, has followed Henry in using the two dashes. The long parenthesis, coming when Vergil has hardly started, is inherently improbable. But while editors do not use the dash after *Latio*, many of them have it before *multum*. Why should they? If *iactatus* is just a participle agreeing with *qui* (l. 1), no considerable break in the sense can be assumed. *Ille* is then continuative, and ties the participle more closely to what precedes: the pause before *multum* must not be too long, and a comma is enough. If *iactatus* means *iactatus est*, then the most obvious thing is to begin a new sentence with *multum* and simply put a period after *litora*. Long ago some editors did this, but it has been out of fashion for at least a century. I suggest that it be restored. *Ille* would then be emphatic and laudatory, as is Homer's $\delta \gamma'$ in *Od.* i. 4. The stronger punctuation is supported by Quintilian xi. 3. 37, a passage too little noticed in this connection. In explaining how the first lines of the *Aeneid* are to be read, Quintilian says there is a *distinctio* after *litora*: "*quia inde alius incipit sensus.*" It is plainly more of a pause than those he has just suggested after *cano, oris, Italiam*, and

profugus, though it is less, as he says, than the pause after *Romae* (l. 7). Punctuation is, to be sure, a bad thing to fuss over. *De distinctionibus non disputandum*. Nevertheless, if we indicate the pause after *Romae* by beginning a new paragraph, use a period after *litora*, and save the comma for the pause after *cano* (l. 1), we shall get approximately Quintilian's notion of the relative strength of the pauses. When Quintilian says that after *litora* "*alius incipit sensus*," he must be taking *iactatus* as *iactatus est*. That Servius makes it agree with *qui* does not mean much—you can't trust him even on Latin idiom. Silius Italicus vii. 474 (*tum pius Aeneas, terris iactatus et undis*) has nothing to do with this point, not being a quotation.

How far does the sentence beginning with *multum* go? It depends partly on what one takes as the antecedent of *unde*. The characteristic unreliability of Servius is illustrated again by his remark that *unde* cannot have a person but only a place as its antecedent! The Servius Danielis does better: *sed veteres "unde" etiam ad personam adplicabant, ita ut ad omne genus, ad omnem numerum iungerent, ut hoc loco "genus unde Latinum" masculino generi et numero singulari iunxit*. In other words *unde* refers to the *vir* of the preceding lines. Henry (*op. cit.*, I, 145-47) argues stoutly for this, but he has not convinced anybody. The Servius Danielis does not cover the whole ground, for *unde* can easily have as its antecedent not only a place or person, but the general idea of a preceding clause. Tiberius Claudius Donatus takes it so here, and it seems likely that Roman readers generally would take it so, because the *vir*, though he remains grammatically the subject of everything in the first five and a half lines—down to *unde*—nevertheless loses prominence in the midst of other ideas introduced during those lines. How much, then, does the antecedent of *unde* include? Is it everything in the first five and a half lines? Then there should be another period after *Latio*, to indicate that *unde* goes no more closely with *multum-Latio* than with the preceding *arma-litora*. (A case of *unde* beginning a sentence is found in *Aen.* vii. 778). But *unde* must not be expected to swallow too much in the way of an antecedent. Probably it refers only to the founding of the city and the bringing of the gods to Latium—ideas which immediately precede *unde* and in which the passage *multum-Latio* culminates. In that case *Latio* and *unde* should be separated by a comma. So a period after *litora* and a comma after *Latio* seem best to satisfy the needs of punctuation at these points.

CLARENCE P. BILL

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

NOTE ON VERANIUS

In an article entitled "Quinti Veranii, Pater et Filius" published in a recent issue of *Classical Philology*¹ Professor R. S. Rogers says:

Very few persons of the family are known to us; besides the two Quinti, the daughter of the younger, Verania Gemina, who became the wife of Galba's in-

¹ XXVI (April, 1931), 172-77.

tended successor, Piso; Veranius Flaccus, a writer mentioned by Octavian in a denunciation of Marcus Antonius' literary style; and a Veranius mentioned by Macrobius, conceivably identical with Veranius Flaccus or with our elder Veranius.

From this statement it appears that Professor Rogers meant to include in his list all Veranii, at least for the general period of which he is writing, of whom we possess any information. If this is true, then it seems worth while to call attention to one rather serious omission from his list. I refer to the Veranius mentioned several times by Catullus.¹

Our only source of information about this Veranius is Catullus. From him we learn the following: that Veranius was an intimate friend of the poet and of a certain Fabullus with whom Catullus closely associates him; that Veranius and Fabullus were once in Spain together, whence they sent to Catullus *sudaria Saetaba* highly treasured by the poet as a gift from dear friends; that Veranius, again with Fabullus, was a member of the suite of a provincial governor Piso; that the trio of friends dined together, jested together, and exchanged experiences as travelers and as sufferers under unscrupulous provincial governors.

It is impossible to read from these meager allusions anything certain about Veranius' career. Whether the journey to Spain and the unhappy experiences under Piso refer to one and the same incident does not appear. Cn. Piso was *quaestor pro praetore* in Spain in 65; L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus was governor of Macedonia in 57-55. Ellis² thinks that the Piso referred to by Catullus was the former, that the two incidents were one, and that Veranius was in Spain at about the same time that Catullus was in Bithynia with Memmius. Friederich³ and Merrill⁴ are inclined to the view that there were two journeys, one to Spain and the other to Macedonia with Calpurnius Piso, and that the latter date was the date also of Catullus' sojourn in Bithynia.

However this may be, the fact that Veranius was a subordinate member of a governor's staff in very much the same status as that of Catullus in Bithynia in the decade 65-55, taken in connection with the manner, at once playful and warmly affectionate, with which Catullus speaks of him, warrants the assumption that he was of about the same age as the poet. The date of his birth, therefore, may reasonably be placed between 90 and 80 B.C. Such a date would in turn make it possible to identify him with the Veranius Flaccus mentioned by Suetonius⁵ and included in Professor Rogers' list.

It may be added that Schanz-Hosius⁶ lists a Veranius Flaccus who wrote on

¹ 9, 12, 28, 47.

² *Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford, 1889), on carmen 28.

³ *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig, 1908), on carmen 28.

⁴ *Catullus* (Boston, 1904), Intro., pp. 68-69.

⁵ *Augustus* lxxxvi. 3.

⁶ *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (München, 1927), p. 600.

religious topics in the first century B.C., and cites Hübner as identifying this Veranius with the Q. Veranius of Tacitus' *Annales* ii. 56, and Hirschfeld as identifying him with the Veranius Flaccus of Suetonius.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

GEORGE HOWE

ON APULEIUS *METAMORPHOSES* II. 32

In chapter 32 of the second book of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius is found the following account of how Lucius, returning tipsy to the house of his host Milo, thought that three inflated bladders were thieves trying to break in:

Dumque iam iunctim proximamus, ecce tres quidam *vegetes* et vastulis corporibus fores nostras ex summis viribus inruentes ac ne praesentia quidem nostra tantillum conterriti, sed magis cum aemulatione virum crebrius insultantes, ut nobis ac mihi potissimum non immerito latrones esse quidem saevissimi viderentur.

The two most recent editors of the *Metamorphoses*, Helm (1913) and Giarratano (1929), prefer the reading *vegetes*, which is found in the best, as well as most, of the manuscripts.¹ One manuscript (Bertinianus) has the reading *utres*, which is quite impossible, since it would spoil the story at this point and is obviously a gloss based on the *dénouement* where Lucius discovers that the supposed robbers had been only bladders. According to Oudendorp (ed. 1786), *vegetos* is written in Guelferbytanus prior (where Hildebrand [ed. 1842] gives the reading as *vegetes*). Eyssenhardt (ed. 1869) prefers *vegetos* (labeling the reading "*vulgo*"), although the form could neither modify the nominative *quidam* nor agree with any other word in the sentence. Hildebrand emended *vegetes* to *vegetes*, explaining that *vegētes* in the manuscripts could have readily become *vegetes*.

The form *vegetes*, adopted by the two most recent editors, can be explained only as an otherwise unknown form of the participle *vegetes* where the *-n* would have been lost. It seems, however, that a far more reasonable explanation is the emendation *vegetis*, preferred by Oudendorp (1786), Bursian,² and Van der Vliet (ed. 1897). *Vegetis*, "vigorous, active," would then be connected with *vastulis* by *et*, and both adjectives would afford an appropriate description for stalwart robbers. The change of *-is* to *-es* could be the correction of a scribe who thought the word an adjective which should be in the nominative, modifying *tres quidam* like the *inruentes* below. *Vegetis*, then, fits perfectly into the text and does not require us to accept an otherwise unknown form *vegetes*, nor one which seems impossible of translation like *vegetos*.

KENNETH SCOTT

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

¹ Laurentianus 68. 2 and 29. 2; Dresdensis; Regius; Fuxensis; Oxoniensis; Guelferbytanus prior et posterior; d'Orvillianus.

² *Sitz.-Ber. d. bayr. Ak. d. Wiss.*, philos.-philol. Kl., 1881, p. 126: He refers to "das schon von alten Abschreibern richtiggefundene *vegetis*."

OCTAVIUS IN THE *CULEX*

Those who accept the *Culex* as Virgilian have either followed Scaliger in changing the *annos xvi* of Donatus' life (Brummer, *Vit. Verg.*, p. 4) to *annos xxvi* (which Professor W. B. Anderson has shown [*CQ*, X, 225] there is no reason to do) or assumed that Virgil wrote the poem in his school days and either published it some time afterward, perhaps adding a dedication, or left it to be published after his death. Of those who have denied the *Culex* to Virgil, the greater number—Baehrens, Leo, Teuffel, and Plésent among them—have on various grounds placed its composition not later than the Augustan age, and it can be plausibly argued that the poem was known to Ovid and imitated by him. It has generally been assumed that the Octavius addressed in the poem as *venerande* and *sancte puer* is the person who became the Emperor Augustus. The objection to this view—that there is no real evidence that Virgil knew Gaius Octavius at the time when the poem must have been written if Virgil wrote it—was seen by Ribbeck and Plessis and has more recently been clearly stated by Professor E. K. Rand (*Harvard Studies*, XXX [1919], 115); but the old view, either in its simple form or with the embroideries of Professor Conway, continues to find belief and Professor Wight Duff (*Literary History of Rome*, p. 492) begs the whole question in a footnote which refers to "the man who, as Octavius, had been Virgil's early patron."

Another difficulty in this view is presented by a small piece of evidence which may have been overlooked. In his note on *Ecl.* i. 42 Servius states that before this the Senate had passed a decree forbidding the application of the word *puer* to Octavian, *ne maiestas tanti imperii minueretur*, and that this was the reason why Virgil used *iuvenis* in that line. Would it have been possible to publish a poem in which Augustus was twice addressed as *puer*, after the passing of this decree? It surely would not have been tactful. It has been suggested that Virgil produced the poem (written, perhaps, some ten years before) in 44/3 B.C. in the flush of enthusiastic admiration for the young man who when he was twenty was ruling an army and well on the way to ruling an empire. This might bring the poem before the date of the *Senatus consultum* to which Servius refers, but 44/3 B.C. was just the time when Octavian, as we see from Suetonius *Aug.* 12 and Dio xlv. 4 (cf. J. H. McCarthy in *CP*, XXVI, No. 4, 372-73), was showing himself very touchy about references to his *pueritia*—he made them an excuse for his change of attitude toward the Senate—and an allusion to it would hardly be likely to commend the most well-meaning admirer to his favor. Even Plésent's forger, if we take the desperate course of assigning the *Culex* to him, producing his pseudopigraphum "à l'apogée du règne," when it could have the advantage of Virgil's popularity, might reasonably be supposed to know of the official ban on *puer*. The point has not much weight in itself, but it adds to the difficulties of the traditional view and may confirm the belief that Octavius, whoever he was, was not the emperor.

C. J. FORDYCE

JESUS COLLEGE
OXFORD

SCHERIA—CYPRUS

In *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LX (1929), 155-78, I put forward several reasons for thinking that the author of the *Odyssey*, in his treatment of the "godlike Phaeacians" and their distinctive institutions, had in mind the contemporary inhabitants and culture of the island of Cyprus, or, at any rate, of the western extremity thereof. Literary tradition and archaeological findings have alike shown that Late Mycenaean civilization lingered on in this Mediterranean backwater for centuries after its complete obliteration elsewhere.

I notice that Forrer ("Vorhomerische Griechen in den Keilschrifttexten von Boghaz-köi," *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft*, LXIII, 18) does not hesitate to identify the Hittite "Biggaya" with "Cyprus" on the strength of an observation of Stephanus of Byzantium, who says (s.v. *Κύπρος*) that one of the six ancient names for the island was *Σφήκεια*. This can hardly signify "Wasp island"; it is in all probability a pre-Greek word. If Forrer is right in his disregard for the initial sibilant, there is still less difficulty to be encountered in equating the country of the Phaeacians, Phaiakia (a word later than Homer, but of orthodox formation), with *Σφήκεια*.

Another coincidence may not be lacking in significance. J. L. Myres, in his classic study of the ancient "thalassocracies" (*JHS*, XXVI [1906], 84-130), finds particularly compelling reasons for placing the sea-power of Cyprus at 742-709 B.C. Bowra, who analyzes the chronological situation with a coldness and aloofness truly Olympian, has recently come to the conclusion (*Tradition and Design in the "Iliad"* [1930], pp. 251 ff.) that the *floruit* of Homer must be placed at least as late as the middle of the eighth century. Now, the amazing comings and goings and the feats performed by the Scherian ships are strongly suggestive of the existence of a Phaeacian thalassocracy. If the author of the *Odyssey* was active during, say, 750-730, and the Cypriote thalassocracy commenced in 742, it would seem that the poet was writing—even if with his tongue in his cheek—of something very near home.

A. D. FRASER

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

NOTE ON PORPHYRY *VITA PYTHAGORAE*, § 53

ἡ μὲν δὴ περὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν πραγματεία τοιαύτη τοῖς Πυθαγορείοις. καὶ διὰ ταύτην πρωτίστην οὖσαν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ταύτην συνέβη σβεσθῆναι, πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὸ αἰνιγματῶδες, ἔπειτα διὰ τὸ καὶ τὰ γεγραμμένα δωριστὶ γεγράφθαι, ἐχούσης τι καὶ ἀσαφὲς τῆς διαλέκτου καὶ μηδὲν διὰ τοῦτο ὑπονοεῖσθαι καὶ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἀνιστοροῦμενα δόγματα ὡς νόθα καὶ παρηκουσμένα τῷ μὴ ἄντικρυς Πυθαγορικοῦς εἶναι τοὺς ἐκφέροντας ταῦτα. πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις τὸν Πλάτωνα καὶ Ἀριστοτέλη Σπεύσιππὸν τε καὶ Ἀριστόξενον καὶ Ξενοκράτη, ὡς φασὶν οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι, τὰ μὲν κάρπιμα σφετερίσασθαι διὰ βραχείας ἐπισκευῆς, τὰ δ'

ἐπιτόλαια καὶ ἐλαφρά καὶ ὅσα πρὸς διασκευὴν καὶ χλευασμὸν τοῦ διδασκαλείου ὑπὸ τῶν βασκάνων ὑστερον συκοφαντούντων προβάλλεται συναγαγεῖν καὶ ὡς ἴδια τῆς αἵρέσεως καταχωρίσαι.

Porphyry is enumerating reasons for the extinction of the Pythagorean philosophy: it was riddling, it was expounded in the Doric dialect which was obscure and . . . and in addition to this, etc. The words καὶ μηδὲν διὰ τοῦτο ὑπονοεῖσθαι yield no satisfactory sense. They are translated in Kiessling's edition "atque hanc ob causam nec dogmata ea dialecto consignata intelligi possent," etc. But ὑπονοεῖσθαι cannot mean simply "intelligi." The passages quoted for this meaning by Stephanus do not justify it. It always connotes suspicion or subaudition or, at the best, conception. Grammarians and late writers use it of texts the genuineness of which is suspected. E.g., schol. Hom. N 390, ὑπονοεῖται ὁ στίχος. That is the meaning required here. The authenticity of these Dorian writings was suspected. If we read καὶ μὴν for καὶ μηδὲν, the sentence construes smoothly in this sense, and καὶ μὴν takes its proper third place in the series πρῶτον μὲν . . . ἔπειτα . . . καὶ μὴν . . . πρὸς δὲ τούτοις. The combination καὶ μὴν is similarly used *infra* in § 59: τεκμηραίμεθα δὲ . . . περὶ . . . καὶ μὴν περὶ τοῦ, etc.

I may note further that διασκευὴν below makes no sense bracketed with χλευασμὸν. It may be due to ἐπισκευῆς in the preceding line. The new Liddell and Scott, *s.v.* Part V, invents the special meaning = ἀνασκευή for this passage. But why should Porphyry thus misuse a well-known word? We should read διασυρμόν, which is often associated with χλευασμὸν, or διαστροφὴν, which occurs in *De abst.* i. 13.

PAUL SHOREY

BOOK REVIEWS

A Greek-English Lexicon. Compiled by HENRY GEORGE LIDDELL and ROBERT SCOTT. A new edition revised and augmented throughout by HENRY STUART JONES with the assistance of RODERICK MCKENZIE. Part V, *θησαυροποιέω-κώψ*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.¹

With each added number of the new Liddell and Scott the wonder grows. Nothing remains for the reviewer but to try to contribute his mite. The editors are naturally most interested in overlooked words, in papyri, inscriptions, and similar sources. But in the hope that they will ultimately pay heed to minor corrections of meanings and interpretations I continue my notes. Nearly all the oversights marked on my copy of the older edition are here corrected. A few however remain:

In Pl. *Protag.* 322 C *ικανός* is not "a match for," "the equivalent of"; s.v. *καγχαλάω*. *Il.* iii. 43 is misconstrued. Under *καί* a usage worth noting and generally overlooked is omitted. I may call it the *καί* of quotation. This *καί* should rarely, perhaps never, be translated "also" or "even." Cf. e.g. Pl. *Gorg.* 525 D; *Laws* 680 B, 681 E; Ar. *Eth. Nic.* 1116 a 21, 1109 a 31; *Eth. Eudem.* 1229 b 40, 1230 a 18; and many other examples. The treatment of *καὶ γὰρ* is very slight. The only translation given is "for also," "for in fact." This seems to assume the disproved theory that *γὰρ* in this combination usually retains its original asseverative meaning and is not to be explained by an ellipsis. Cf. Geneva Misener, "The Meaning of *Γάρ*," Chicago dissertation. Under *καῖτοι* the triumphantly argumentative use is omitted. Cf. Shorey in *Class. Jour.*, III (1907-8), 27-30. Under *θύραθεν* there might well be a reference to the famous passage of Aristotle *De gen. an.* 736 b 28, and under *κατὰ πόδα* to Pl. *Sophist* 243 D. *κακοσχόλως* omits the rhetorical sense. Cf. Eustath. ad *Od.* i. 354, *Et. Mag.*, s.v. *ὀρσοθύρη*; Spengel, *Rhet. Graec.*, III, 198; Schol. Ar. *Acharn.* 397. For the omitted rhetorical sense of *κομπώδης* cf. Ernesti *Lex. tech.*, s.v. *Καταβάλλω*, add Protagoras' *καταβάλλοντες* (Diels, *Vorsokr.*, II², 228); for *κατάστασις* add Protagoras' *περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως* (Diels, *op. cit.*, p. 231); for *κενεμβατεῖν* add the odd use in Xenophanes (Diels, A. 41 a). For *καταλαμβάνω* add the pun in Lucian *Sale of Lives* 27. *κλιμαξ* is better defined in the old edition. The proverb *δὲς κράμβη θάνατος* is omitted. In Soph. *Ajax* 970, *θεοῖς τέθνηκε*, the dative is not instrumental. *καλῶς ἀγωνίζεσθαι* is not "fairly on the merits of the case" but "successfully." Cf. Demosth. lvii 2, Lys. iii. 20. *καίπερ οὐ πολλῶν ἄπο*, Soph. *Philoctet.* 647, is not

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XXV (1930), 82-83.

= καίπερ οὐ πολλῶν ὄντων. Cf. Aesch. *Persae* 800, 1023; Thucyd. i. 110; Theoc. xvi. 87. οὐ κατὰ Μιθραδάτην, Herod. i. 121, is not "answering to the description of him." Cf. ii. 10 and Pl. *Apol.* 17 B. In *Il.* xv. 136 κυδομήσων is not construed with ἐς Ὀλυμπον; s.v. καρδιακός. The meaning "dyspeptic" is overlooked.

PAUL SHOREY

Histoire romaine. Tome premier: Des origines à l'achèvement de la conquête (133 avant J.-C.). PAR ETTORE PAIS. Adapté d'après le manuscrit italien par Jean Bayet. ("Histoire générale," publiée sous la direction de GUSTAVE GLOTZ: "Histoire ancienne," troisième partie.) Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1926. Pp. xxiv+664.

The present volume is certain to remain useful and to be extensively employed for years. It bears the marks of the authorship of an able scholar who has investigated independently many of the problems involved and who is extremely careful in all his judgments. The volume will be consulted as a convenient guide to the views of its distinguished author, but it is also detailed enough to be valuable as a work of reference. It contains a general bibliography for Roman history. In addition, bibliographical notes at the head of the various chapters furnish a guide to the older literature on the subjects under consideration. The footnotes that abound on almost every page are useful chiefly as a guide to the sources. When the author's interpretation differs from the one commonly accepted, this is normally indicated, and occasionally a specific work giving an interpretation rejected by the author is cited. The volume would have been much more useful if this had been done more frequently and if footnotes had summarized various views and cited the literature on important disputed points. The volume contains several maps, but they by no means cover all the areas involved. In general the reader will usually find a good atlas more satisfactory. The plans of battlefields and cities will be found more useful. The reviewer personally was grateful for the plan of Nova Carthago. The latter is attributed to Davidson, while the map itself shows the "rivage antique selon Strabon-Davidson." It apparently is borrowed, directly or indirectly, from Strachan-Davidson's *Selections from Polybius*. The volume contains an Index and a detailed Table of Contents.

The general plan of the work is not satisfactory for a volume that forms a part of an "Histoire générale." There seems to have been something fatal in the title of the volume which has resulted in an excessively narrow Roman point of view and has caused other early Italian civilizations to be slighted. This is all the more regrettable since the author has shown in his *Storia dell' Italia antica* and special studies that he possesses the knowledge which should have enabled him to sketch the growth of Rome against the background of the varied civilizations of the period. Similarly, when he comes to the period

of Roman expansion, the author has failed to write with a broad outlook over the Mediterranean world. A more sympathetic treatment of the problems of the Ptolemies and Seleucids would have been desirable, while the treatment of Greece and Macedonia is weakened by the complete failure to consider the Hellenic League of Antigonos Doson and Philip V. Most readers will feel also that the wars have been given a disproportionately large space and that social and economic developments have been treated too briefly. They are completely neglected for the period after 200 B.C.

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

La conquête romaine. Par ANDRÉ FIGANIOL. ("Peuples et civilisations: Histoire générale," publiée sous la direction de LOUIS HALPHEN et PHILIPPE SAGNAC, Vol. III.) Deuxième édition, revue et augmentée. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1930. Pp. 526 and 2 maps. Fr. 50; bound, Fr. 60.

Since this is the first volume of the present work to be reviewed in *Classical Philology*, a few words about its general plan may be appropriate. Of all co-operative general histories now in the process of publication, "Peuples et civilisations" in many respects is the most attractive and the most helpful in supplying in the least space the greatest aid to the specialist in rounding out his knowledge and in giving to the beginning student as broad a view as possible. Volume I, *Les premières civilisations*, by five authors, carries the story of the Near East and Greece down to the foundation of the Persian Empire. Volume II, *La Grèce et l'Orient*, by Roussel and collaborators, continues to the Roman conquest. The volume of Figaniol relates the history of the western Mediterranean to 29 B.C. Volume IV, *L'empire romain*, by Albertini, carries on into the fifth century. In Volume V, *Les barbares*, Halphen discusses the invaders of Europe and the interaction of civilizations from Roman times to the eleventh century. At times there is a certain amount of overlapping between volumes. Thus, phases of Hellenistic history are included both in Volumes II and III, while the barbarians are mentioned in other volumes than V. Each volume attempts to draw a broad picture, taking into consideration all interrelated civilizations. Remote parts of the world are ignored as long as they remain isolated. Then, when the contacts become closer, the horizon is broadened. To give an example, China is mentioned by Roussel in the Introduction to Volume II only to be dismissed because it was still isolated. In Volume III Figaniol gives a little space to the country on account of Chinese influence in pushing invaders westward and on account of the efforts of the Han emperors to make contacts with the west. In later volumes, as interrelation becomes more close, the country is treated more fully. Each volume has its own index. At the beginning of each chapter, and generally at the be-

ginning of each subdivision within the chapters, there is a bibliographical footnote with moderately extensive references to modern works. Naturally, space does not permit detailed citation of sources. Some volumes, among them that of Piganiol, also give a general bibliography in an appendix. The volumes on ancient history all show a laudable desire to compress and avoid overloading. The printing and quality of paper are only fair.

Piganiol at the outset states that his view of Roman history is not unlike that of Polybius. Before Roman intervention in the east, the history of Europe and the Mediterranean does not need to be written under the form of universal history. He begins with prehistory, but confines himself to the west except to note the effect of eastern influences in the west. Such influences, however, are frequently noted. From the time of Roman intervention in the east, the volume becomes a general history of the Mediterranean world. The chief merit of the work is the manner in which events taking place in different and often remote regions are connected. The author has succeeded in concentrating an astonishing amount of material in a brief account. No one will agree with all interpretations, but there are few downright mistakes. To give a couple of examples, the river Halycus in Sicily is placed west of Selinus (p. 114), and it is stated that Attalus bought Aegina from Rome (p. 194) instead of from the Aetolians. The bibliographical notes are very good, though any scholar will note important studies that have been omitted. The proofreading, without being perfect, is good. The two maps have little merit.

In the second edition, though the old plates have been used, a very laudable effort has been made to bring the volume up to date and to remove mistakes found in the first edition. There is an eight-page supplementary bibliography citing recent literature. Changes in the text are not infrequent. At times only a word or two have been altered. In other places there are more extensive changes. The statements concerning the history of coinage on pages 142 and 152 f. have been recast. On page 231 a new paragraph has been inserted. On page 454 there has been inserted a sentence concerning Greek influence on Roman law. In some cases the recasting of a section has caused new mistakes to creep in. The worst example probably is on pages 315 f. The printing is not as good as in the first edition. It is to be hoped that, when a third edition is issued, the volume will be entirely reset.

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Hésiode, Théogonie, Les Travaux et les Jours, Le Bouclier. Texte établi et traduit par PAUL MAZON. L'Association Guillaume Budé. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1928.

Professor Mazon was designated for the editorship of the Budé Hesiod by his admirable edition of the *Works and Days* published in 1914. It is almost superfluous to add that he has done an excellent piece of work which makes

all the essential results of Hesiodic scholarship accessible to, and enjoyable by, the intelligent general reader.

Convention puts first the constitution of the text. The Budé editions, as a rule, pay more attention to this than do the majority of the Loeb translations. Professor Mazon has performed this task conscientiously. In addition to exercising an independent judgment on the stores of Rzach, he has himself collated several manuscripts and weighed the evidence of the papyri and the *testes* which he cites. He ventures only one or two emendations of his own: in works 357 *στε καὶ μέγα δώη*; in 462-63 transposui; in 532 *οἱ ... ἔχουσι*. His introduction gives a clear account of the history of the text, and not only tells the young student all that he needs to know, but is, like many of the introductions to the Budé editions, an illuminating lesson in method. His conclusion: "Nous devons ... constituer un texte éclectique" may be extended from Hesiod to all much-edited authors, and especially, as I have often said, to Plato. I have had the curiosity to compare his text with that of the pre-Rzach Paley. In the first 500 lines of the *Works and Days* there is only one divergence that affects the thought or the style, his acceptance in 141 of Peppmüller's *θητροῖς* for *θητροί*, and there are only three or four variants that appreciably affect spelling or grammar.

The work represented by this erudite critical apparatus had to be done. Professor Mazon has done it critically and well. But it is largely a labor of love performed for its own sake in the spirit of Browning's grammarian:

Let me know all. Prate not of most or least
Painful or easy.
Even to the crumbs I'd fain eat up the feast
Ay, nor feel queasy.

The translation, so far as an alien may judge, is not only correct and lucid, but delightful. A reader habituated to Shakespeare, Milton, and Shelley may doubt the courage of the French language to do full justice to Aeschylus and Pindar; but Professor Mazon's French prose reproduces the archaisms, the naïvetés, the technicalities, the moralizings, and the occasional fairy-tale tone of Hesiod perfectly. His command of archaic French and of the farmer's vocabulary always furnishes him the inevitable, which proves to be also the picturesque word.

The interpretation of Hesiod is pretty well settled, and only a few passages are so ambiguous as to lend countenance to differing translations. In *Theog.* 41 Professor Mazon renders *λειριόεσση* *lumineuse*, in 422 he renders *τούτων ἔχει αἶσαν ἀπάντων* "lui abandonnent une part des privilèges qu'ils ont reçus." In 523 *μέσον διὰ κίον' ἐλάσσας* "qu'il enroula à mi-hauteur d'une colonne." In 569 *ἀντὶ πυρός*, where the Loeb translator more explicitly renders "as the price of fire" he has "en place du feu." I do not recall that any editors compare Plato *Protagoras* 355 E. In 727 he renders *δαρήν* *bouche*. In *Works and Days* 182 he translates, "Le père alors ne ressemblera plus à son fils."¹ In 281 he

¹ Cf. *infra*, p. 199.

retains the conventional rendering "Zeus au vaste regard," where the English translators substitute "Zeus of the far-borne voice." In 269 he seems to take τήνδε δίκην generally as *la justice*, rather than as the particular suit that Hesiod has in mind. In 360 he refers ἐπάχνωσεν φίλον ἦτορ to the wrongdoer himself, not to his victim. Is not that moralizing or christianizing Hesiod overmuch? In 518 τροχάλον he, with the majority of editors, disregards Jebb's rendering "one which makes an old man trot." In 759 μηδ' ἐναποψύχειν is perhaps a little bowdlerized by "ne t'y baigne pas non plus."

The brief exegetical notes, unencumbered by superfluous erudition, cut many of the gordian knots of controversial scholarship with common sense, and, taken together with the introductions, supply all that is needed for the understanding of the text. I note a few points at random: Professor Mazon accepts as genuine the Prologue to the *Works and Days* and the description of winter. He thinks that the subject of the *Theogony* sufficiently accounts for the differences of style between it and the *Works and Days*. He gives an interesting account of the *agon* between Hesiod and Homer and its symbolic reference to the contrast between two schools of poetry. He renounces the attempt made in his earlier work to determine precisely the interpolations in the catalogue of days. He sensibly finds no contradiction of the Prologue in *Theogony* 96, and none between the present tense used of Prometheus in 616 and the description of his release in 528 ff.: "De même un Chrétien verra le Christ éternellement sur sa croix." Pandora, he thinks, is the present of all the gods to mankind, not she to whom all the gods gave gifts. There is no satire intended in *Works* 348. To illustrate the lack of continuity and transition in the *Works and Days*, he quotes Sainte-Beuve's comparison of Hesiod and Franklin. It might be observed, further, that Isocrates already generalized the rule that paraenetic discourses dispense with transitions.

The *Shield* is not by Hesiod. It is one of the most mediocre works that have come down to us from antiquity, but one of the most instructive, since it exhibits the "perpétuel devenir" of early Greek epic poetry.

PAUL SHOREY

Greek Comedy. By GILBERT NORWOOD. Boston: John W. Luce & Co., 1932. Pp. vi+413. \$5.00.

It has been a pleasure to observe Professor Norwood's steady growth since his somewhat slight and unsatisfactory first book, *The Riddle of the Bacchae*,¹ to this, his latest and perhaps best. It is, I think, even better than its companion work, the book on *Greek Tragedy*, which I reviewed elsewhere.² His material lay ready to his hand in Kaibel's fragments, Lorenz' *Epicharmus*, A. W. Pickard-Cambridge's *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, Wilhelm's *Ur-*

¹ Cf. *Class Phil.*, IV (1909), 337-38.

² Cf. *New York Evening Post*, December 31, 1920, p. 6; *Weekly Review*, February 16, 1921, p. 160. Cf. also *Class Phil.*, XX (1925), 351.

kunden, Denis' *La comédie grecque*, Legrand's *Daos*, Körte in Pauly-Wissowa, and the entire literature on Aristophanes and Menander. But out of it he has organized the one readable, comprehensive survey of the entire subject and produced a book which combines in happy measure instruction, entertainment, and scholarship, with original comment and literary criticism.

Professor Norwood writes as one well acquainted with the literature of his subject. But he is not slavishly dependent upon it. He has studied the texts himself, and he does not think it necessary to describe in detail every mare's nest discovered by a too ingenious philology. Many irresponsible fancies are disposed of in a single trenchant sentence. Little space is wasted on origins or hypothetical biographies.

The speculations of Mr. Cornford¹ and Miss Jane Harrison are not mentioned. The life of Aristophanes occupies a brief page. These economies leave space for what is and should be the content of the book, the literature itself, its ideas, its literary form, its criticism of life, and the writer's comment upon them. Professor Norwood quotes in the Greek or in apt English versions of his own and others a large part of the best things in the writers studied, especially those whom we possess only in fragments. He somewhere quotes or alludes to most of the good things that modern critics and commentators have said about them, and adds thereto a goodly quota of *asteia* of his own.

From all this wealth of material I can only select for mention a few points that interest me. Professor Norwood sensibly rejects the silly legends about the origin of comedy undistinguishable from the no less futile stories about the beginnings of the idyll with which unwise teachers used to burden the students' memory, and he dismisses the "Gliederung" of Zielinski as resting upon "an astounding insensibility to the very nature of drama." He recognizes that Aristotle's sketch of the history of comedy is perfunctory. He accepts in general terms the development of the New Comedy from Euripides; he rightly rejects the fragments of Epicharmus forged to prove Plato's plagiarisms, but wrongly, I think, translates *πρᾶγμα* "action" (p. 88): "Is there such an action as flute-playing?" The forger here is imitating the Platonic idiom *καλεῖς τι*, and *πρᾶγμα* is "thing." His treatment of Aristophanes is relatively less full than his account of *Eupolis atque Cratinus* and the rest. He gives brief, pregnant summaries of the eleven extant plays, supplemented by a few pages of praise and criticism. The *Knights* he peremptorily pronounces "a bad and stupid play." He prefers to it the *Wasps*, the *Peace*, or even the *Lysistrata*. He ranks the *Birds* first and the *Frogs* second. Aristophanes' comedies, he says, are farces—sublime farces. But he thinks that he can trace a tendency to the development of real plot construction in the more mature and later plays.

About half as much space is given to Menander as to Aristophanes. We are warned against current overestimates of him and against the assumption that

¹ Cf. *Nation*, C (1915), 172.

Terence was only a translator who may therefore be safely used for the reconstruction of his originals. Professor Norwood discusses the various reconstructions of the newly recovered plays, adds some suggestions of his own, and concludes with a few well-written pages of criticism and illuminating comparisons with the modern English drama.

The appended chapter on metre and rhythm in Greek poetry will actually do what so few treatises on Greek metre accomplish—help the ordinary student to read Greek poetry metrically. It should work a revolution in Canada. The slight following strictures are more than counterbalanced by this prevailing merit: The statement repeated from the similar chapter on metre in his *Greek Tragedy* that in English "the length of the syllables has no effect on the scansion" is in a certain narrow technical sense true. But it will mislead.¹ It is confusing (p. 376) to call *Knights* 551 ff. trochaic and *Knights* 773 ff. glyconic. It is true that "a well trained ear is the chief guide," but it is dangerous to rely too much on the reader's or the student's natural ear, which is too often mistaken for the trained ear. Like Mr. Thomson,² Professor Norwood tries to lead the student on by a specious inductive method which begins by setting out a passage of poetry as prose and observing the natural divisions. Long experience in teaching Greek metre has convinced me that it is better to begin dogmatically by telling the student how to scan the "feet" and encouraging him to use his natural ear later. It is a mistake, I think, to start from the period and the colon rather than the foot. If a student learns to scan by "feet," his natural ear will in time bring out the cola sufficiently. If he begins with the cola, he will be confused by the difficulty which Professor Norwood faces (p. 383) but does not overcome, of defining the colon or giving any infallible rules for determining it that do not involve the entire debate between the "old" and "new" metric.³

On page 385 the metre of Arnold's poem "Ye storm-winds of autumn" is not, I think, bacchiac but loose English anapaest. The error is that of those late Greek metricians who judged the meter of a poem by the accident of its first line. We must judge by the poem as a whole. Some lines of Arnold's poem could be read as bacchiacs, but there are some lines that cannot possibly be so read, as e.g.,

Where the high wood strips sadly
Ye are bound for the mountains

and there are no lines which do not admit "anapaestic" scansion. In *Greek Tragedy*, p. 356, Professor Norwood says that the lines are bacchiac but that the poet probably intended dactyls.⁴ The same question may be raised with

¹ Cf. my article on "Word-Accent in Greek and Latin Verse," *Class. Jour.*, II (1907), 219-24.

² Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XXV (1930), 91-94.

³ Cf. my paper on "Choriambic Dimeter, etc.," in *TAPA*, XXXVIII (1907), 57-88.

⁴ For the question of English anapaests cf. "The Issue in Greek Metric." *Class. Phil.*, XIX (1924), 169 ff.

regard to Callicles' Song in *Empedocles on Aetna*, which Mr. Bailey (*Continuity of Letters*, p. 108) compares with Aeschylus' *Septem* 104-5. But the only good parallel to the Aeschylean bacchiac that I can recall in English poetry is the experimental line in Browning's "Hervé Riel,"

For up stood, for out-stepped, for in struck
(a)mid all these.

The prevailing movement of Arnold's poem is roughly anapaestic. Bacchiac scansion would separate prepositions from their regimen, *O* from its vocative, divide words unnaturally, and impose an artificial slowness on the whole. Cf., e.g.,

Not here, O Apollo . . .
In the spring by their road . . .
Through the black rushing smoke-bursts. . . .

The reason why writers on metric so often fall into this type of error is that the nature and predominance of anapaestic movement in English poetry has never been clearly recognized in spite of Swinburne's repeated admonitions. The metrists fail to recognize the license of the apparent dactyl and the virtually spondaic iamb in English anapaests, and continue to classify as "dactylic" poems of Swinburne which he himself tells us are anapaestic. On page 387 the lovely lines which Swinburne himself entitles "choriambs" are designated as "greater asclepiads" or "longer sapphics." On page 388 Professor Norwood oddly stigmatizes the Eupolidean as "a curious and ugly metre." That is a matter of taste, but he ought not to say that "it is certainly impossible to get any 'feet' out of the first four syllables of the colon." It is perfectly possible, and it is even possible to reproduce the movement in English.

PAUL SHOREY

Survivals of Roman Religion. By GORDON J. LAING. "Our Debt to Greece and Rome." New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1931. Pp. 257.

Although the collection of parallels between the life of today and that of antiquity in Italy, including, of course, those in the field of religion, has engaged the reviewer's attention during many years, he is too well satisfied with the selection of examples in this book to gratify his self-esteem by proffering in criticism substitutes or supplements of his own. The only department of religion that he judges to have been rather slighted even for such a compendious volume is that of "psychic phenomena." The physical manifestations of modern spiritism and the mediumship based on trance conditions have behind them an unbroken and important tradition traceable far back of the day when the early Christians saw and believed and Pliny the Younger saw—trembled, perhaps, in dubiety—and wrote his well-known letter of query.

Under the limitations set by the series, Dr. Laing could not argue for his conclusions upon mooted questions in detail, but his decisions are set forth in

no spirit of dogmatism, and he leaves his reader with all his rights to disagree unimpaired. Sane handling was, of course, particularly necessary. For the study of ancient religion with all its uncertainties is especially likely to kindle the imagination to the point that theories come faster than the facts to support them, and the need for adequate substantiation is particularly great when one is exploring what claims to be Christianity today for survivals from the paganism which, it is popularly believed, the founders of that religion were bound to annihilate. Those, however, who have given special study to the rise of Christianity know to what extent the spirit of accommodation and compromise was abroad among the leaders of the new faith, and Dr. Laing has shown with admirable tact and skill how, with or without sanction from the organized church, avowed Christians are carrying on many practices of Roman paganism in more or less disguised or changed form. In other words, there are certain imperishable elements in religion connected with ideas and aspirations that seem eternal. The sort of nature that in the days of polytheism needed a particular spirit to whom to appeal for each trouble that required supernatural relief may turn today to this or that saint as a familiar wonder-worker, not too far removed from humanity to understand and sympathize. The book gives fascinating examples of the modern working of the ancient practices with documentation from ecclesiastical sources that is beyond questioning.

Because of the relative warmth and emotional sincerity of ancient domestic worship as compared with the formal ritualism of state ceremony, we might expect to find some carry-over from the cult of the lares, penates, and genius into the domestic worship of our own time. Instances are given, and the relationship of the genius to the popular conception of a guardian angel is discussed. The material on serpent-worship is necessarily scant. The chapter on "The Gods of Marriage" offers less than might have been expected; the gods almost fail to appear. When, however, we come to the deities of the countryside and their festivals, we have much interesting lore. The Saturnalia receives ample and judicious discussion because of our propensity to regard it too much as the model of Christmas. The interpretations of the mockery of Jesus before his death as due to his having been made king of the Saturnalia by the Roman soldiers is rightly declared improbable. The relation of the carnival to the pagan celebration receives less discussion than I had anticipated. But compression was imperative, and one of the merits of our book is that its text and notes tempt the reader to further study "on his own."

Particularly novel to the reviewer was the connection between river-spirits and devils which the chapter of that name suggests. Discretion doubtless led to minimizing the evidence for phallic worship in Italy today. Those who know the southland have seen traces of it in strange places. The belief inherent in the pagan Roman that the spirits of the dead could affect the lives of the living now takes the form of faith in saints as intermediaries and intercessors. Our author shows how and why the motive of ingratiating prompted and prompts the ceremonies of funerals and festivals. All Saints' Day and All

Souls' Day had their pagan prototypes. In successive slender chapters we find discussed the possible relationship of various deities to modern religious customs: Diana, Minerva, Fortuna, Hercules, Castor and Pollux, Aesculapius (the practice of incubation has by no means gone out of use), and Poseidon-Neptune. The idea that man may be deified next engages attention in a discussion (under the title "Man-God") of emperor-worship, saints, relics, and miracle-working. Dr. Laing deals with the cults of foreign divinities with justifiable caution: Cybele, the Egyptian deities (among whom Isis, in her cult, was so influential upon the monachism of Christianity and Isis and Horus are pictorially so much a parallel to the Madonna and Child), Adonis, and Mithras. In the case of the last the survivals and parallels from his worship are, of course, numerous. Sabbatarians may not care to be so much indebted to Mithras for their Sunday, nor many orthodox believers to the sun-god of Aurelian for the date of Christmas. The chapters on "Prayer and Adoration," on "Sacrifice," and on "Processions and Dances" are crowded with terse information, and include such topics as sacramental banquets, sacred cakes, votive and expiatory offerings, indulgences. Next come sections dealing with "Divination," "Sacred Edifices," "The Religious Usages Common to Pagans and Christians," where the subheadings are holy water, music, bells, lights, incense, veiling, garlands, tonsure, etc. "Idea of Regeneration and Conceptions of the After-Life" introduce the reader to other survivals. A final chapter considers the continued use of the material remains of paganism, buildings, statues, decorations, altars, etc. Even this terse summarizing makes clear the importance of this volume for college and university students and the enjoyment that it holds out to the cultivated layman as well as to the scholar.

The Bibliography is excellent. Although it is necessarily brief, the significance and interest of Etruscan influence require, it seems to me, the addition of C. G. Leland's *Etruscan Roman Remains in Popular Traditions* in subsequent editions of the volume which its delightful charm and sound learning would seem to guarantee.

WALTON BROOKS MCDANIEL

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Rome and the Romans: A Survey and Interpretation. By GRANT SHOWERMAN. New York: Macmillan Co., 1931. Pp. 643.

Although the author of this book in his earlier days did such work in technical research as would have justified a continued devotion to such labor, he recognized years ago that the more difficult but often more needed service was to give an attractive literary dress to the facts of scholarship and so to "humanize" learning as to make it interesting alike to the layman and the specialist. Since the continuation of classical scholarship itself depends ultimately upon the preservation and the quality of classical teaching in our schools and colleges and to no small degree also upon the support of educated laymen, a

book of scientific accuracy written in a popularizing style to cover the whole field of Roman civilization for all who are interested in Rome deserves more extended notice than it can receive here. There is nothing quite like it in English, and every high-school library will need a copy for reference purposes, while it will serve also admirably for collateral reading in college Latin courses. A cheaper edition has already appeared.

Since the volume compasses in summary fashion so much of the history, public and private antiquities, religion, topography, geography, and archaeology of the Roman Empire, it reveals inevitably some unevenness of treatment. Part I, entitled "Rome and Its Meaning," is so instinct with enthusiasm for the subject as to inspire the student to further reading. Notable, too, is chapter xxxvii on "The Spread of Roman Civilization," which recalls the broad viewpoint that Dr. Showerman has emphasized in his teaching at the American Academy. While he uses constantly the method of comparison and contrast, he rarely lets his personal opinions about modern life lead him to such emotional eloquence as his arraignment of modern athletics evokes (pp. 349-51) or to the covert criticism of wholesale education (p. 372): "in lands too poor, too wise, or too distrustful to attempt the education of the masses." Only occasionally is the book dull, and that is almost always when an effort to list and classify every particular has crowded out interpretation and left the mere facts largely unrelated to human interest. This weakness appears sporadically in his chapter on the criminal xxxv). The subject of Roman law (xli) also lacks the stimulating treatment that one might have expected from the author.

The mere allusions are rather commonly to the more familiar writers Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, and Horace, and these four and Marcus Aurelius receive also special treatment in a chapter (xxv), "Roman Portraits," but Dr. Showerman also introduces well-chosen, enlivening passages from Greek and Latin works of all periods, translations which are commonly derived from the Loeb Classical Library. About two hundred maps and pictures also illustrate the text, many being of the less hackneyed sort, and several very recent and so especially welcome. The labels are helpful and slips in accuracy are few, but in the famous painting from Ostia of "The Ship of Abascantus" (p. 242) the student may think that the captain's name is Farnaces Magister, and there was plenty of room on page 51 to make the "Plan of Rome in A.D. 64" large enough to include the Aedes Divi Iuli and the Regia, duly labeled. In general the maps do not reach the high level of the pictures. The plan showing the *atrium* as square (p. 77) might escape criticism, but the general statement that that apartment was "square" (p. 76) had better be emended; the proportions are too often oblong. Also, the representation on the plan of an area at the rear of the peristyle labeled "shrubby" instead of the more typical room is misleading.

There are a few other points of archaeology that we might query here. Would it not be better to speak of the toga (p. 57) as drawn "under or over the

right shoulder" instead of merely "under"? On page 60 it is surely incorrect to say that the "Roman man wore a ring that was usually made of iron." This continued, of course, to be the material of the *anulus pronubus*, but citizens who wore rings at all from Cicero's time on used those of bronze or the finer metals. On page 91 the statement that all the *praenomina* were abbreviated by the use of the initial except Manius needs emendation. On page 117 the description of the three boys in the marriage procession as being "no doubt in white" can be bettered; Festus says they were *praetextati*. On page 133 we have the careless definition of the *triclinium* as "a dining table at which the diners reclined." On page 142 we read: "The sun-dial . . . is not portable." A pretty specimen of one that could be carried in the pocket, now in the Museo delle Terme, may have been one of many in its day. What reason is there for believing that "by Cicero's time the *as* was little used" (p. 225)? Even in my own collection I have scores of them. Authoritative opinion is now adverse to the identification of the transept of Santa Maria degli Angeli as the *tepidarium* of the Thermae. I noted almost no merely typographical errors, but two of importance appear on the same page (59): *endormis* for *endormis* and "broad-trimmed" for "broad-brimmed." The accuracy of the work is exemplary.

At the end of the volume are chapters on archaeological remains in various provinces which obviously do not attempt to give anything like proportionate treatment: Germany, for example, is rather neglected, while the account of Northern Africa is so full as to be very useful to a specialist planning a giro, although quite out of tone in a popularizing book.

Two topics that deserved extended treatment have been neglected and could hardly have failed to be attractive because of their nature, the palaces of the Palatine and the life therein, the villa and *villeggiatura*.

WALTON BROOKS MCDANIEL

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Four Plays by Euripides: "Alcestis," "Medea," "Hippolytus," "Iphigenia among the Taurians." Translated with interpretative essays and notes by AUGUSTUS TABER MURRAY. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1931. \$3.50.

This beautifully printed convenient volume seems well fitted for what it was meant to do. Professor Murray wishes to aid the modern reader in understanding the drama of Euripides by giving a prose version that shall be more faithful to the original than are the verse translations that have appeared in the past. A prose rendering, he says, cannot give the effect of the original work of the poet, but neither can a translation in verse, which usually substitutes the translator's own poetry for the original. This is undoubtedly true, and the translation of Professor Murray is free from the "padding" and the

straining that necessarily accompany the attempt to secure the proper rhyme and metre. But though not professedly metrical, Professor Murray's translation is by no means unpoetical in most passages. He uses poetic diction throughout, as anyone who would reproduce the spirit of the original inevitably must; but one of the most interesting characteristics of his translation is the—whether conscious or unconscious—rhythmical nature of many passages. Indeed, especially in the stichomythia and at the beginning and end of speeches, one frequently finds many consecutive perfectly acceptable iambic pentameter lines; e.g., in *Hippolytus* 612 ff.:

- 'Twas but my tongue that swore; my mind swore not.
- O son, what wilt thou do? Wilt slay thy kin?
- My kin! The wicked are no kin of mine.
- Be merciful; to err is human, child.

Medea 333 ff.:

- Begone, rash woman; rid me of my troubles.
- Troubles! I have mine own, and need not thine.
- Soon shall the hands of servants thrust thee forth.
-
- Thou wilt make trouble, woman, as it seems.
- I will go forth; 'tis not for this I pray.

Medea 389 ff.:

So must I still delay a little space;
Then, if I find some tower of sure defense,
I shall through guile and silence work this work
Of blood; but if mischance shall drive me forth
And leave no way, myself shall grasp the sword—
Yea, though I die—and slay them; I shall go
The road of daring to the awful end.

When he essays to translate a particularly poetical passage he is irresistibly drawn into verse, perhaps because he feels the poetry irresistibly or perhaps also because at times the verse translations of others are lingering in his mind. So in *Alcestis* 937–38 he translates:

For her no grief shall touch forevermore
And glorious she hath rest from many toils,

which recalls Way's translation. *Hippolytus* 1440 ff., perhaps the loveliest thing in all Euripides, he renders more faithfully and with more beautiful simplicity than either Way or Gilbert Murray:

Farewell, and joy go with thee, blessèd maid.
Lightly thou leavest our long fellowship.
And I forgive my father at thy wish,
For I have ever harkened to thy words.

"Lightly thou leavest our long fellowship" exactly translates the Greek *μακρὰν δὲ λείπεις ῥαδίως ὁμιλίαν*, words too tender and reverent to be reproach-

ful, yet touched with ineffable pathos, which Gilbert Murray's "Thou wilt not grieve in heaven/For my long love" somehow misses.

There are passages in other metre besides the iambic, so *Hippolytus* 245 ff.:

Veil me. The tear streameth down from mine eyes,
And my color is changed to the hue of shame.
Ah, the coming to reason is fraught with pain!
Madness in sooth is an awful thing,
But 'twere best to die unknowing.

And 223 ff.:

My child, what meaneth this madness of longing?
What part is thine in hunting with hounds?
Or why thy craving for fountain springs?
Here close by the walls is a watered slope,
From the streams whereof thou mayst drink thy fill.

Both of these recall the rhythm of Way's translation of the same passages. But *Medea* 421 ff. does not:

The songs that the bards of old have sung
Shall cease to tell of our faithlessness.
For Phoebus, the master of lays, hath not
Bestowed on our spirits the wondrous gift. . . .

In spite of his poetical diction, Professor Murray usually avoids daring metaphors or strained expressions even where they occur in the original. So, for example, he translates *νοστί τὰ φίλτατα* (*Medea* 14) simply "the dearest ties are failing," while Way renders "Love is sickness-stricken" and Gilbert Murray expands it to ". . . true love/Sick as with poison." In *Hippolytus* 614 he does not try to give the force of *ἀπέπτυσ'*, but neither does Gilbert Murray, while Way renders "Avaunt the word." There are few expressions that jar, though now and then a phrase seems stilted. But in *Alcestis* 695 "having sneaked past thy appointed fate" does not seem necessary for *παρελθὼν* . . . *τύχην*, and three lines farther on "her fine young man" has associations too colloquial to make it a suitable translation for *τοῦ καλοῦ* . . . *νεανίου*.

The Foreword on Euripides is very brief but fair and to the point, and gives the essential facts. The introductory essays to each of the four plays are well written and quite sufficient to give the reader such information about the story as he needs and to suggest the problems presented in the play. The notes are brief and perhaps owe something to those of Gilbert Murray's edition, e.g., those on *Medea* 131 ff., 285 ff., 364 ff., 866 ff., 825 ff., 663 ff., *Hippol.* 616 ff., 732 ff., 1283; *Iphigenia* 344 ff. Yet these are all points that would call for comment in any edition.

One is glad that Professor Murray mentions Browning in connection with the *Alcestis* and Racine in connection with the *Hippolytus*, and makes the interesting point that the reason for Alcestis' silence in the last scene may be

in a way explained by the lines in Tennyson's "In Memoriam" on the raising of Lazarus:

The rest remaineth unrevealed.
He told it not or something sealed
The lips of that evangelist.

STELLA LANGE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Sextus Pompey. By MOSES HADAS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930. Pp. vii+181.

It would be interesting to know the actual genesis of biographies. Do they spring from an already existing interest in the subject or his times? Are they written for the primary purpose of presenting new historical data or interpretations? Are they definitely planned to glorify or damn the subject? Our answer in this particular case will go far to determine our judgment of Dr. Hadas' book.

The volume is attractive in appearance, and, generally, in style, well documented and convincing in its statements of facts. Dr. Hadas believes that the last years of the Republic are dramatic and important, so important that even the lesser actors demand careful study and proper evaluation. Among these minor actors was Sextus Pompey, and "a fairer estimate of the career of Sextus Pompey should give a truer appreciation of the work of Octavian" (p. v).

The first 160 pages give a detailed and sometimes laborious narrative of Sextus' life, followed by an appraisal and a brief account of sources, a List of Abbreviations, which serves also as a Bibliography, and an Index. Dr. Hadas has scrupulously assembled the ancient evidence, reviewed the opinions of moderns, and worked the whole into a complete and valuable biography of the younger son of the triumvir.

The important part of Sextus' career—and the narrative here has sound foundations—begins with Cicero's efforts on his behalf in 43. Sextus had a fleet, was needed to help raise the siege of Mutina and for later service against Antony, and he might even accelerate the glide into oblivion which Cicero planned for Octavianus. So Sextus became *praefectus alae et orae maritimae*, and this position he would not admit he had lost with a change in government which he regarded as illegitimate. Nevertheless he was proscribed by the Lex Pedia of 43, and nothing was left him but the irregular procedure which historians generally have agreed to call piracy. Dr. Hadas rejects the term, though he admits that some of Pompey's actions resemble those of a pirate. The Treaty of Misenum in 39 restored him to a definite status in the state, granted him compensation for his lost estates, bestowed honor and the prospect of honor upon him, and in consequence the blame for the war against him is placed by Dr. Hadas largely upon Octavianus.

Dr. Hadas is charitable toward Sextus' faults and weaknesses. His ruling motive was his *pietas*: the cognomen *Pius* appears on his coins (p. 152). He regarded himself as legitimate heir to his father's place in the state, and his claims are identical with those of Octavianus (p. 162 and elsewhere). Many of Sextus' actions are due to his "splendid impracticality" (p. 152), and he stands comparison with Sertorius, Lepidus, Octavianus, Labienus, and Brutus. "Sextus being no worse, if no better, than his contemporaries, how did it come about that historians have conspired, as it were, to blacken his reputation? The answer is that our histories of the period in which Sextus figured are derived from a source or sources hostile to Sextus" (p. 162). This ultimate origin of the tradition was official, inspired, pro-Augustan, and, so, anti-Sextan. Modern historians have erred because they have followed the ancients, who in turn followed this prejudiced and untrustworthy source, but also partly because failure made Sextus a rebel (p. 93) and partly because they do not admire all the manifestations of his "splendid impracticality" (p. 161). This explanation seems probable if not true.

Opinions will differ as to how successfully some of the author's points are established, but I am ready to admit that Sextus has been maligned, misjudged, or slighted. But as my knowledge of him has increased, my uncertainty regarding him has grown. I recall that Cicero once tried to induce Luceius to write a special history of the period in which Cicero held the spotlight. I suspect that had Luceius accepted the tempting suggestion, the result would have been something like this book, when the two were compared with continuous historical narratives. The focus is not the same in a biography and in a history.

I come back to my original questions. Dr. Hadas provides an answer, into which I may put something that is not there: "It *shall be* the purpose of this monograph to trace the career of Sextus, and to make it clear that he was not merely the corsair chief that history has painted him, but the legitimate successor to the claims of his father, and the active representative of a considerable section of Roman sentiment" (p. 2; my italics). I do not know whether the book is biography or apology. My approval of it is genuine, whichever it is, but it would be more intelligent if I knew whether "the purpose of this monograph" was determined after, during, or before composition.

EVAN T. SAGE

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The Greek of the Fourth Gospel. A Study of Its Aramaisms in the Light of Hellenistic Greek. By ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931. Pp. ix+143.

In this short study Dr. Colwell gives the *coup de grâce* to the view, still held by some, that the Fourth Gospel is replete with Aramaic reminiscences owing to either direct copying from Aramaic originals or to the fact that the author

was thinking in Aramaic while composing his work. His attacks are especially directed against Burney, the latest propounder of such a theory; but occasional blows are also dealt at Montgomery, Torrey, and some others in sympathy with such an attitude. The author bases his results on a comparison of the language of John with that of the *Discourses* of Epictetus and of the papyri, and his conclusions are in perfect agreement with the opinions of New Testament scholars who years ago expressed their doubts concerning the soundness of the "Aramaic" theory and reiterated their belief in the comparative purity of the language of the fourth evangelist. I venture the remark, however, that his conclusions would have gained appreciably in weight had he decided to draw more on late and modern Greek, the importance of which for the interpretation of New Testament texts has been repeatedly pointed out with particular emphasis by such Hellenistic scholars as Thumb, Deissmann, Moulton, Hatzidakis, and others.

The question of Semitisms in the New Testament has for a long time engaged the attention of biblical students. At first, wide currency was obtained by the view that the New Testament was almost entirely Semitic, written in a dialect other than Hellenistic Greek. This attitude, however, was considerably changed following the appearance of the pioneer work of Deissmann, who, by carefully examining the language of the papyri and the inscriptions, was able to prove that the language of the New Testament was substantially the same as that of contemporary writers of the Koine. Soon afterward, other scholars, notably Moulton, following closely on Deissmann's footsteps, adduced further evidence from the non-literary papyri for the unity of Hellenistic Greek. To be sure, no one would be so bold as to assert that the New Testament is entirely devoid of Semitic influences; but to discover in nearly every word or expression, only apparently deviating from established Greek usage, the marks of a Semitic background is to commit an unpardonable anachronism and to convict one's self of insufficient knowledge not only of Hellenistic Greek but also of the classical and the later stages of the language.

One is indeed surprised to find that such regular constructions as the use of the plural verb with singular subject, the demonstrative pronoun following the relative, the present tense used for the future, the use of *μέρος* as a noun, the interchange of *περί* and *ἐν*, the causal use of the relative pronoun, etc., are taken as indicative of Aramaic influence in John. To take a case in point: We are told that John's use of parataxis is non-Greek. But it is a very well-known fact that paratactic arrangement of sentences is very common in the language of the people and in the literatures which display a tendency to imitate the popular idiom. It is frequently employed in the Homeric poems, as well as in Attic comedy and in Demosthenes (cf. Brugmann-Thumb, *Griech. Gr.*, pp. 639 f.), and it is not unknown in Latin (cf. Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gr.*⁵, pp. 661, 687) and the later stages of both languages (cf. Pfister, *Wochenschr. f. klass. Philol.*, XXVIII [1911], 809 ff.). Likewise it is very much at home in modern Greek (cf. Thumb, *Handbuch*², § 261.). There is, therefore, nothing

unusual in John's use of parataxis, especially since the same construction is current in both inscriptions and papyri, as has been aptly pointed out by Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*⁴, pp. 105 ff.

It is arguments like these that the author of the work under consideration makes his business to refute. It is not, of course, very difficult for him, evincing a complete acquaintance with Epictetus and possessing an extensive knowledge of the papyri, to demolish with comparative ease such views as he examines in the present work. We feel sure that Dr. Colwell's little book will, for some time at any rate, relegate to a deserved oblivion all theories which continue to speak of an "Aramaic" origin of the Fourth Gospel, and we are of the opinion that in the future it will be practically impossible for anyone to attempt to resuscitate these theories without considerable modifications and retractions.

P. S. COSTAS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Character-Portraiture in Epicharmus, Sophron and Plato. By JOHN M. S. McDONALD. Columbia University Dissertation. Sewanee, Tenn.: University Press, 1931. Pp. vi+403.

Beginning with an exhaustive study of all indications of the portrayal of character in Epicharmus and Sophron, this book goes on to collect and distribute to the appropriate pigeonholes of its multiplied classification all passages of Plato pertinent to the same subject. There are separate sections for characterization by infrahuman analogues, animal, vegetable and mineral, mythical analogues, human analogues, and puns. And all the personages of Plato are studied both as individuals and as types, *les jeunes gens de Platon*, enthusiasts and mockers, representatives of various callings, poets, rhapsodes, soothsayers, professional educators, patrons and pupils of professional educators, and philosophers. The chapter on Socrates, for example, though it wastes no time on the speculations and contradictions of philologists, brings together, I think, all relevant passages in the Platonic writings. The author apparently works in English, but is acquainted with Greek and knows the "literature," which he quotes aptly and in detail, especially for Epicharmus and Sophron. His citations of Plato are so full that they might often be incidentally used for the study of Plato's philosophy, a purpose which he disclaims. His book is a monument of industry and a useful repertory of facts and citations for anyone who wishes to go over the same ground. He has done what he set out to do and faithfully followed the method prescribed as an ideal for books of this class. I shall not attempt to compare it with the character-studies in Jowett's introductions or the well-known book of Ivo Bruns, and it would hardly be fair to criticize it from the point of view of a more flexible and less matter-of-fact approach to the interpretation of Plato.

PAUL SHOREY

Robert Burton's "*Philosophaster*," with an English Translation of the Same, Together with His Other Minor Writings in Prose and Verse. By PAUL JORDAN-SMITH. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1931. Pp. xvi+283.

Some fifteen years before the publication of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, and, as he is careful to note, six years before the publication of Ben Jonson's *Alchemist*, Burton wrote, in 1606, a Latin comedy which was revised in 1615 and "acted and shewn" for the university by the students of Christ Church in 1617. The play, incidentally mentioned in the *Anatomy*, enjoyed only this "footnote immortality" until the year 1862, when it was published from Burton's own manuscript by Mr. W. E. Buckley in an edition of sixty-five copies. The present edition, in default of access to the other manuscript presented by Burton to his brother, is printed from a copy of Buckley lent by the New York Public Library and includes Burton's will and minor Latin poems with the addition of some Latin verses prefixed to the 1617 edition of Rider's *Dictionarie* discovered by Professor Edward Bensly.

It was worth while to make Burton's youthful skit accessible to students of literature not only for the light that it throws upon the *Anatomy* but for its own sake. It is better reading, if not a better play, certainly than the Latin dramas of Buchanan and probably than the imitations of them by his teachers in which Montaigne took part as a schoolboy. The plot is of the simplest and most naïve. The Duke of Osuna establishes in Andalusia a university to which flock, as in the second half of a comedy of Aristophanes, a motley crew of charlatans, exploiters, and projectors—professors, students, physicians, jurists, alchemists, astrologers, physiognomists, pedants, grammarians, logicians. The obligatory love interest is tardily introduced by a Terentian girl who turns out to be the daughter of the best friend of the father of an ingenuous student.

The interest of the play lies wholly in the satire of pedantry and pseudo-science in the separate scenes which recall Lucian, Erasmus, Ben Jonson, Rabelais, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and sometimes anticipate Ludvig Holberg's *Erasmus Montanus*, and Molière's *Bourgeois gentilhomme*. It is as thickly crowded with classical and scholastic allusions as are the pages of the *Anatomy*. It is here freely translated into a racy, somewhat Burtonian English, which draws upon Elizabethan idiom as aptly but more temperately than Mr. W. J. M. Starkie's version of the *Clouds* and *Acharnians* of Aristophanes. The translator's task was not an easy one. Burton's style, like Swinburne's, retains its flavor and the exuberance of its vocabulary in whatever language he writes, and his command of Latin words and phrases is prodigious. There are passages that might trip a very fair Latinist such as Latinists are today, and, though this translation is correct enough as a whole, Professor Jordan-Smith and his colleagues have sometimes stumbled: Page 28, *Ego vero qualis quantusque sum, totus sum tuus* does not mean "In sooth, I am so much in that sort that I am wholly thine"; page 34, *Admittatur illico* does not mean "He is admitted directly"; page 38, *Et quidni sedemus* is not "And in what order sit we?"; page 44, *usque* is not "even now"; page 60, *Et sic scire est per causas*

scire is not "And so, to know is to know through discussion" (the reference is to Aristotle's well-known dictum that true knowledge is knowledge through causes); page 70, *Et apud Idiotas audio vir doctissimus* is not "And I, the most learned of men, give ear to fools"; page 74, *Viderint has tricas fratres natu minimi* is not "Younger brothers know well enough the vexations that, etc."; page 120, *Satis pro imperio* is not "'Twas spoken in accord with good authority." It might be Elizabethanly rendered, "How absolute the knave is." *Ciceronem auctorem habeo* is not "I consider Cicero an authority."

The notes, for which large credit is given to Professor Bensly, explain obscurities sufficiently for the ordinary reader. Professor Bensly has perhaps a keener eye for allusions to the learned literature of Burton's contemporaries and predecessors than for latent quotations of the classics, though he has ferreted out a great many of these. But there are also many which he misses or has chosen to disregard, e.g., the repeated allusions to Plato's satire of the omniscience of Hippias of Elis; page 36, the point of *per antiphrasin ludi magister*; page 62, the Aristotelian allusion *omnis scientia Dianoetica fit a praecedente cognitione*;¹ page 80, the meaning of the *sphaeram novam* which might have been illustrated by a reference to Buchanan's poem *De sphaera*; page 86, the blend of motives from Theocritus, Juvenal, and Latin love elegy in the verses beginning *Non ego divitias Arabum*; page 88, the Virgilian parody of *Digiti sunt consule digni* and several other Virgilian reminiscences; page 92, the source of *patella dignum operculum*, which is, I presume, also the source of the French *couvercle digne du chaudron*; page 176, the allusion to the *Odyssey* in *O utinam vidisset me, etc.*; page 186, the source of *non omnibus dormio*; page 190, the source of *Neptunum a terra*. On page 208 *ne . . . aut ars malè audiret ob abusum artificis* is not "Lest . . . the Faculty be of ill report by occasion of the abuse of these crafty ones." It is a reference to the argument of Plato's *Gorgias*, Isocrates, and others that the abuse of any art does not discredit its use. On page 214 *impletur arx multitudine impellentium* is clearly a reminiscence of Lucian's *Piscatores*. On page 124,

Quo pede prius Helena Trojanum littus apulerit?
Et quot vini cados Aeneae Aestes dederit?

might have been referred to Juvenal *Sat.* vii. 235, *Dicat quot Aestes vixerit annos*; Seneca *Epist.* 88; Plutarch *Quest. conviv.* 9.4, "Which hand of Venus did Diomedes wound?"; Sueton. *Tiber.* 70; Quintil. i. 8. 21; Lucian *De mercede conductis*; Vives on education, page 102; and further illustrated by Sir Thomas Browne's "What song the Syren sang"; Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*, III, 3, "I knew him in Padua, a fantastical scholar, etc."; Butler, *Hudibras*, I, 172 ff., "He knew the seat of Paradise, etc."; and many other variations on the topic.

But it would require a Burton adequately to annotate Burton, and the witty modesty of the translator's Introduction anticipates and disarms this goniobombyc style of criticism.

PAUL SHOREY

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XIV (1919), 184.

Aristotle's Psychology of Conduct. By A. K. GRIFFIN. London, 1931.
Pp. 186. 10s. 6d.

This Toronto dissertation, inspired by Professor Brett, begins with a brief sketch of Aristotle's psychology and his psychological point of view which is said to be modern in that it treats man as one of the animals. The statement, I think, should have been qualified for the modern reader's sake by a quotation of *Nicomachean Ethics* 1177 b 31, "We ought not to obey the admonitions of those who bid us, being men, to think only as men and, being mortals, to think mortal thoughts, but as far as may be to immortalize ourselves and do all in our power to live in accordance with that which is best in us." But perhaps Professor Jaeger has convinced the author that this is not the true Aristotle but only a bit of Platonic rhetoric left over from his callow youth.

The chief terms of Aristotle's psychology and ethics are carefully defined and discriminated, and the rest of the volume is in the main a survey and analysis, with abundant quotation, of the underlying psychology of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, beginning with a list of *πάθη* or emotions and instincts which is made to include such feelings as wonder and the desire for rhythm, and proceeding systematically through the entire list of Aristotelian virtues that form character. The author nominally includes in his investigation the *Magna moralia* and the *Eudemian Ethics*, which he uncritically accepts on recent fashionable authority as earlier works of Aristotle. But very little is said of them, and the book is mainly a study of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, supplemented by the more popular ethics of the *Rhetoric*.

Desire, Dr. Griffin says, is for Aristotle the fundamental motive force of conduct, and the one element that must be common to all parts of the soul in any division. Plato's tripartite division of the soul is, he thinks, now generally recognized as really a division of desire. That shows the difficulty of working with English words. Plato might use the verb *ἀρέσθαι* of the *νοῦς* or pure reason yearning and reaching out for truth, but surely the associations of the English "desire" are quite alien to the *νοῦς*. I do not however intend to attempt a criticism of the book. As soon as we look below the surface, the psychology of the *Nicomachean Ethics* becomes one of the most puzzling problems in the entire history of philosophy. It could be critically treated only with constant reference to passages of Plato that Aristotle had in mind and divination of the motives or accidents that led him to employ one synonym here and another there. Dr. Griffin takes little account of the relation to Plato and seems to me to evade ultimate problems which he could hardly be expected to discuss in a volume of this size. In any case he gives quite as much as the English reader can assimilate, and his numerous apt and sometimes extended quotations of the Oxford translation, together with the constant references in the footnotes, make of his book a useful guide for the ordinary student of the subject.

PAUL SHOREY

Elementi primitivi nella poesia Esiodea. By R. CANTARELLA. "Estratto dalla rivista Indo-Greco-Italica," Anno XV (1931), Fasc. III-IV. Napoli: Stabilimento Industrie Editoriali Meridionali, 1931. Pp. 45.

This useful monograph is regarded by the author as material for a possible more exhaustive study by means of a continuous exegesis and as preparation for a more general inquiry into the primitive forms of Greek poetry. Those who, like myself, believe that the study of "origins" is at present overstressed may prefer this clear enumeration of facts to those more ambitious undertakings. Professor Cantarella tabulates primitive elements as follows: (I) periphrastic expressions, enigmatic expressions, euphemistic expressions; (II) oracular motives; (III) proverbs; (IV) sentences and precepts (1) in general, (2) Delphic, (3) Orphic, (4) Pythagorean, (5) the Seven Sages; (V), (1) fables, (2) other various motives, (3) formal elements, assonance, rhyme, homoioteleuton. Under each of these rubrics he gives a sufficient, if not always exhaustive, list of examples from the text, with critical remarks wherever they are needed. It is impossible to go over this ground with him here. I will venture to submit to him one doubt which I have always entertained about the rendering which he accepts of *Opp.* 182-84, οὐδὲ πατὴρ παῖδεςσιν ὁμοίος οὐδέ τι παῖδες. He illustrates this by 235, Catull. 61. 217-21, and other passages on the resemblance of sons to their fathers. But is that the meaning here? Must not ὁμοίος here be taken to mean "in harmony with," "friendly to," "at one with"? Is it really possible to construe the passage on any other assumption?

The collections under v. 3 are especially full. Professor Cantarella distinguishes external rhymes, external homoioteleuton, internal rhymes, internal homoioteleuton, and homoioteleuton rhymes between the second hemistich of one verse and the first hemistich of the following. It is interesting to note that to an Italian ear only double or feminine rhymes count as rhymes. Others are classed as external homoioteleuton.

The sixty-four compact notes with ample bibliography add greatly to the value of this solid piece of work.

PAUL SHOREY

Excavations at Eutresis in Boeotia, Conducted by the Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University in Coöperation with the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Greece. By HETTY GOLDMAN. Harvard University Press, 1931. Pp. xxi+294; 20 colored pls., 1 panorama, 4 plans, 341 figs.

The excavations here published were carried on in four campaigns, from 1924 to 1927. Miss Goldman was in charge, and it may deserve note that her assistants were all women. Miss Dorothy Cox made the plans and some of the colored plates and apparently contributed largely, in various ways, to the success of the undertaking, but Miss Goldman stands responsible for the en-

ture text. The plans are exceedingly good. For the chief excavated area there are three, one for each level; two of them are on tough transparent paper, rendering superposition possible. The colored plates, made by Miss Cox and Mr. de Jong, are excellent; the reader would have liked some assistance in finding the descriptions of them. The photographs and the small plans in the text are also good; in the latter indications of direction would have been convenient. There is a good Index. A corrigenda slip is devoted chiefly to wholly insignificant misprints. It contains one itself, and one of the pages mentioned in it has two besides that which is noted. On page xvii there is a misprint or slip that really ought to be corrected, since it leaves us uncertain in regard to the authorship of Plate IV. But in general the typography is good; the book lies flat when open and is altogether well made.

It was found that the site known to Homer and later as Eutresis was inhabited throughout the Bronze Age and again from the sixth century onward, though architectural remains from this later period are extremely scant. The excavation was evidently conducted with great skill and care. The book consists of seven chapters. The first, "The Site and Its History," is devoted to the topography of the place and to references to it in ancient authors. In the seventh, "Hellenic Eutresis," the discoveries from the classical period are described and very competently discussed. (The statue at Eleusis, p. 255, is usually dated 430 rather than 450, and the citation seems irrelevant.) The prehistoric period forms the subject of the remaining five chapters: "The Prehistoric Settlements," "The Prehistoric Pottery," "Miscellaneous Finds from the Prehistoric Settlements," "Prehistoric Burials," and "Prehistoric Eutresis: A Summary."

The earliest dwellings were huts with slightly sunk floors and roughly elliptical plan. Early Helladic ware was found in connection with them, but there was also pre-Helladic pottery, indicating the early origin of the huts. Four rectilinear houses from the Early Helladic period are more or less well preserved. They had hearths, usually against a wall, "bothroi," and ashpits. House L (pp. 15 ff.) has a large room at the back which, it is suggested, may have served religious purposes. This house had two periods of habitation, indicated by different floor-levels, and the second is not discussed as fully as one might desire. Were the hearth and the terra-cotta disk covered then? If the door from II to III was blocked during the second period, how was III entered? Is there evidence of a door in that part of the cross-wall which is largely lost? On the site the answers may be obvious, or it may be obvious that the questions are unanswerable; but the reader is not there. In House H there was something that Miss Goldman takes to have been a brick column; at any rate it was cylindrical and rose to a height of at least 0.40 m. To the same period belong also two small curvilinear structures, N and O (p. 26); further description of the latter would have been welcome.

The end of the Early Helladic period was marked, as at other sites, by a layer of ashes. In the Middle Helladic period there were houses of both apsidal

and rectangular types. The former are less numerous and belong chiefly, perhaps only, to the earliest phase of the period. "Bothroi" and ashpits occur in some of the apsidal houses, but not in the rectangular. The hearths are no longer placed against walls. Several rooms contain interesting constructions in clay which appear sometimes to be ovens and sometimes bins. The foundations are thinner than in the preceding period, and the author thinks that ridge roofs were regularly used. Some of the houses are remarkable in that they lack transverse foundations. Evidently there were some brick walls without foundations; and it is not clear why in House S (p. 48), where there appear to be traces of a light foundation at the front, such a wall is not assumed. It seems improbable that the house should have a columned portico and, behind it, a large open room. There is much about these houses that is puzzling; and though Miss Goldman's discussions are acute, it is to be hoped that Mr. Holland's dissenting views, briefly mentioned in the Introduction, will be published.

The houses of the Late Helladic period are unimportant; it is assumed that the roofs were flat (p. 63). A relatively large area was inclosed at this time in a fortification wall. There is an odd slip on page 72: of course the left is not the less protected flank. There ought to have been a second bastion on the other side of the gate; whether existing evidence precludes the possibility is not quite clear.

The pottery is classified and described very minutely and finely illustrated. The "pattern ware" of E.H. III is almost always light-on-dark, as at Hagia Marina, instead of dark-on-light as usually in the Peloponnesus. The author argues, though not overconfidently, that the two styles are different in origin, the light-on-dark being the result of "intensified intercourse with northwestern Anatolia" (p. 230). She accepts and reinforces the theory that Minyan ware is connected with the same general region and with Anau in Turkestan, and suggests that in E.H. III there came "an advance wave of that western movement" which culminated in the invasion of the Middle Helladic people. (Or perhaps a later wave of the E.H. people, pushed on by the westward progress of the M.H. tribes?) The recent suggestion that Minyan goblets were made in molds is rejected (p. 138), and certainly it is not generally true. Miss Goldman takes it as settled that Aigina is the home of matt-painted ware. At Eutresis, as at other northern sites, this is less abundant than gray Minyan, but includes the finest specimen of monochrome matt so far published (Pl. XIII). Cretan influence in the development of Yellow Minyan is rejected. This ware, with matt decoration, is characteristic of the periods ordinarily termed Late Helladic I and II; while the pottery which in the Peloponnesus belongs to these periods, with marked Cretan influence, is almost entirely lacking at Eutresis (p. 124), as well as elsewhere in Central Greece (p. 235). Hence Miss Goldman includes everything (not only pottery) between E.H. and L.H. III in the Middle Helladic period. This is essentially Harland's scheme; but he uses M.H. III-IV as equivalent to Blegen's L.H. I-II, while Miss Goldman makes no

divisions within her long Middle Helladic period. Of course the whole Helladic system is founded on the pottery; but if the chronological terms vary in meaning according to the conditions at each site, they lose much of their usefulness. Harland's M.H. III-IV, which are not ambiguous, could be used where L.H. I-II do not fit.

The significance of the book will be evident. The site is important in itself, especially for the Middle Helladic culture; it is the only prehistoric site in Central Greece that has been adequately published; and the author's discussions, based on wide knowledge and thorough consideration, constitute a very material contribution to prehistoric studies.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Excavations at Olynthus, Part II: Architecture and Sculpture: Houses and Other Buildings. By DAVID M. ROBINSON. "Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 9. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1930. Pp. xxii+155; 4 pls.; 307 figs. \$20.

In 348 B.C. Philip demonstrated the soundness of Demosthenes' warnings by attacking Olynthus. The city fell, and so far as can be inferred from ancient sources was never rebuilt. Ancient Greek cities are usually three-quarters Roman when the excavator reaches them, even sometimes when written history seems to promise better fortune. But at Olynthus Professor Robinson's high hopes proved to be justified; it is evident that after 348 there was no considerable settlement on the site. All that was found, then, belongs to the best Greek period. On the other hand, the absence of later occupation is partly responsible for the slight depth of the soil, which is so unfavorable to the preservation of monuments.

The requirements of such a site are different from those of a prehistoric village, but there is no less need of sound archaeological training, practical experience, and unremitting care. Professor Robinson not only has to his credit an astonishing series of scholarly publications in various departments of classical studies, but is one of the most experienced of American excavators. His chief assistants were George Mylonas, who wrote Part I of the publication and also a separate book on the Neolithic Age in Greece and afterward excavated at Eleusis and Hagios Kosmas for the Greek Archaeological Society, and Clark Hopkins, who is now field director of the Yale excavations at Doura-Europos. Mr. Fomine, who has made many plans of the excavations at Delos and Delphi, was the architect; and the additional staff was unusually large and competent. The scientific character of the excavation is assured both from the personnel of the expedition and from the evidence of the publication.

The first campaign occupied four months in 1928. In this volume the principal results are published. Volume I, written by Dr. Mylonas, contains the material belonging to the prehistoric period; Volumes III and IV, written by

Professor Robinson and dealing with terra cottas and coins, have already been reviewed in *Classical Philology* (XXVI [1931], 339). In the spring of 1931 a second campaign was carried on, and no doubt some of the minor discoveries from the two seasons' work will be published together.

The descriptions in this volume are full, with exact measurements and abundant detail. Similar things found at other places are cited and discussed. The style is less formal than is usual in such books, and some paragraphs lack the elegance that comes from leisured writing, but the information is there. The illustrations are excellent and abundant; some of them are not directly useful to the archaeologist, but they help the wider public to understand the excavator's labors. The figures are on pages to themselves, which are distributed throughout the book, but only the pages of text are numbered. Often two pages, numbered consecutively, have several pages of illustrations between them; it is not the most fortunate arrangement.

In chapter i ("The South Hill") a cobblestone road, some ten feet wide, and a fountain-house at the entrance of the city are described. Greek roads in any sort of preservation are scarce. Chapter ii ("The Religious and Municipal Center") contains an account of a building that had columns inside, perhaps six rows of eleven—an interesting addition to the small group of early hypostyle structures in Greece. Chapter iii ("The North Hill") deals with the most interesting discoveries: a number of private houses of some pretensions. These alone would make Olynthus a site of first-rate importance, since existing houses earlier than 348 are few indeed. A characteristic feature, occurring in twelve of the houses, is a room with a border around the floor, very slightly raised above the central part. The border is cement; the rest often has mosaic paving. The analogy to the Roman *atrium* is obvious but far from complete, and Professor Robinson does not commit himself in regard to the roof. The houses and their contents are described with gratifying fullness, and some of the incidental discussions are important for any student of antiquities; see, for example, pages 47-50, on bathtubs, and pages 79 ff, on Greek mosaics. The description of the site is completed in the fourth and fifth chapters. Chapter vi, by Miss Lillian M. Wilson, is a very satisfactory publication of the loom-weights. Chapter vii ("The Lamps") is again the work of Professor Robinson.

The yield from this single campaign at Olynthus was unusually rich, and the author evidently felt the obligation, to which excavators sometimes seem perfectly indifferent, to make his discoveries accessible to the scholarly world promptly. That his publication is not only prompt but full and satisfactory is a testimony to his industry and conscientiousness and above all to the remarkable erudition which serves as a basis for any research. The publication of the results of the second campaign is eagerly awaited.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A Catalogue of the Greek Vases in the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology, Toronto. By DAVID M. ROBINSON and the late CORNELIA G. HARCUM. Edited, with additions, by J. H. ILIFFE. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1930. Vol. I, 288 pp.; Vol. II, 108 pls. \$10.

It is not very long ago that European archaeologists were discovering the unsuspected existence of important collections of antiquities on the western side of the Atlantic. This book will bring to them a fresh surprise, in which most scholars of the United States will share; for the extent and quality of the collection assembled in Toronto have not been widely known outside of Canada. From the brief sketch included in the Preface, it appears that most of the vases have been acquired within the last fifteen years. This is a remarkable achievement, for which credit is given to the director of the Museum, Professor C. T. Currelly.

Credit for the *Catalogue* must be distributed among several persons. Mr. Pringle made the photographs, one or more for each piece. They are excellent; a few more views of details would have been welcome. The drawings are the work of Mr. Rawles, of the staff of the Museum; they are evidently made with great care, and fulfil their purpose by showing many details more clearly than the photographs. Professor Beazley read all the galley proofs and made revisions and suggestions. Aside from Mr. Iliffe's editing, twelve vases are catalogued by him, and his work is not below the standard of the rest. But it is clear that the book is chiefly the work of the two original authors. It is a worthy scholarly monument to the memory of Miss Harcum and at the same time a substantial addition to the extraordinary list of Professor Robinson's publications.

"The catalogue is limited to a description of the vases and a discussion of their decoration, style, and date, with enough parallels and citations of literature . . ." (p. v). In accordance with this plan there are no general discussions of the groups into which the vases are divided, though in some instances general bibliographies are given. The descriptions are usually full, and in discussions of date and fabric opposing views are noted, but the reasons for them and for the authors' conclusions are presented very succinctly. The literature is copiously cited. The relative scarcity of references to Pfuhl, along with some other features, is probably a result of the long interval between the preparation of the original version and the publication. In general, however, there are full citations of recent special studies. Professor Robinson's wide acquaintance with museums has enabled him to adduce many parallels among unpublished vases; probably there is no other catalogue that contains so many.

The Toronto collection is rich in Cypriote ware, which comprises 123 vases of 636. There is a good parallel for No. 1 in Courby, *Les Vases grecs à reliefs*, page 23. Minoan ware is lacking; No. 73 *bis*, classed provisionally as Early

Minoan, will surely find its permanent place outside the Greek area. Among the recent acquisitions are an Early Helladic, an Early Cycladic, and a Middle Helladic specimen (Nos. 627-29). The 35 Late Helladic or Mycenaean vases are representative but not distinguished. There are several good geometric vases; for ships (No. 113) see Pernice in *Jb. Arch. I.*, 1900, pages 92-96. In regard to Peucetian and Daunian vases particularly, many readers would have welcomed fuller discussion of the very divergent views that are cited. The single example of the Laconian style (No. 204) is dated cautiously, and Droop's articles are not mentioned. The system according to which the *Corpus vasorum* is cited, here and elsewhere, is not very convenient in the present state of that work; it might be well to add in parentheses: "*France*, Fasc. I, Pl. 23."

Attic vases are discussed very fully, as their greater importance warrants. Many of them are assigned to artists, known by their names or by Beazley's; and in some instances several vases painted by one man, as yet anonymous, are noted, and so the reconstruction of a new artist is begun. Once a name is given: the Atalanta-Meleager Painter, active toward the end of the fifth century, makes his bow. The name is as good as he deserves. The best of the red-figure vases is a cylix (No. 356), which Professor Robinson had formerly ascribed to Brygos but now assigns to Makron. The Painter of the Girgenti Calyx-Crater, who ought to have a more tolerable name, is represented by a good crater; and among the recent acquisitions is a good loutrophoros by Polygnotos. In general the black-figure vases are more interesting than the red-figure.

Among the late wares a series of Hadra vases (Nos. 614-25) deserves special attention. And the glass vase (No. 626) found in a Chinese tomb of the Tang dynasty, considered from the historical standpoint or with reference to its unique character, is the most interesting piece in the *Catalogue*.

The volumes do not readily lie open, but otherwise they are well made, and the cost is moderate. Both the Museum and the authors will have the congratulations and thanks of all students of vases.

F. P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Die Thesis, Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte. VON DR. HERMANN THROM, Paderborn, 1932. Pp. 198.

A thesis, Aristotle explains in his *Topics*, is a non-scientific general proposition plausible enough intrinsically or by authority to be worth discussing in dialectical debate. It was no more possible in antiquity to fetter so convenient a word by an exact definition than it is today to prevent college presidents from misusing "protagonist." Aristotle tells us that prevailing usage called all dialectical problems "theses." And he himself uses the word with a half-humorous derogatory connotation in the famous sentence "No one would affirm that unless he was sustaining a thesis."

In the seven hundred following years of Greek philosophy and rhetoric the word took on many shades of meaning and was associated in various ways with such terms as: hypothesis, dialectic, diatribe, *causa*, *περιστατικά*, *ἴδιον*, *κοινόν*, *πρόβλημα*, *τὸ κρινόμενον*, *τόπος*, *communis locus*, *status causae*, etc. Doctor Thom's study of this process is set in the framework of a sketch of the entire history of rhetoric and dialectic. His broadly discursive treatment includes a reinterpretation of the relevant chapters of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Topics*, with incidental polemic against the *entwicklungsgeschichtliche* fancies of Solmsen, an account of the relations and interchanges between dialectic and rhetoric, the definitions and classifications of Hermagoras and the Stoics generally, the cultural ideals of Cicero and Quintilian, and their extension of the sphere of rhetoric to topics of philosophy, the definitions and classifications and bibliography of "theses" in the later literature and the rhetoricians. His discussion of all these questions takes account of the opinion of his (German) predecessors and is supported by extensive quotation of the Greek texts, including apt passages from the Aristotelian commentators. German scholars are to be congratulated that the low cost of printing and the sums available for the publication of their researches enable them to write in this large and leisurely way. A scholar who is compelled to economize printer's ink could reach much the same result in this case in fewer pages by starting with an a priori psychological or common-sense consideration of the obvious human possibilities in the uses of rhetoric and dialectic and then illustrating them briefly by apposite examples from the authors. As I have read through Dr. Thom's book and annotated it for future reference, I am glad that he has adopted the more voluminous, if not more luminous, method.

There are two points on which he especially dwells: (1) The diatribe he thinks is more properly designated as a "paraenetic thesis." It is a form of dialogue or dialectic. This may be, in a sense, technically true. But surely the prevailing and convenient use of the word is to denote the kind of popular preaching found in Teles and in parts of Epictetus and of Horace's and Persius' satires. The answers to supposed objections, the *φησί* and similar colloquial touches, merely serve to enliven the style and break up the monotony of continuous disquisition. There is little real argument, dialogue, or dialectic. (2) Dialectic deals with the general and rhetoric with the particular. This also is true enough in a sense, and might be further illustrated by the distinction in Plato *Theaetetus* 175 C between *τί ἐγώ σε ἀδικῶ* and the *σκέψις αὐτῆς δικαιοσύνης τε καὶ ἀδικίας*. I do not think that in Ar. *Rhet.* 1355 b 25 *ἕκαστον* can be pressed in its support. The meaning is simply "in each or every case."

However that may be, the extent to which general topics enter into a speech is, as Dr. Thom afterward (pp. 81 ff.) virtually admits, a matter of taste, opinion, and the practice of the individual orator. The most successful criminal lawyer in America persuades juries to acquit mainly by general propositions about free will, responsibility, and the sanctity of a murderer's

life. And the Grand Duke Alexander reports that a Russian jury freed a youth who had shot his divorced wife because of their appreciation of a saying of Goethe quoted by the defense, "I have never heard of any crime, however gruesome, which I could not have committed myself."

There may have been some exaggeration, some vanity, some jealousy of the philosophers in the contention of Cicero and his followers that general propositions belong to rhetoric no less than to philosophy. But it remains true that, however sharply Aristotle draws the line between the universal and the particular in his theory of rhetoric and dialectic, it is impossible to draw it in the practice of a clever and highly educated orator.

PAUL SHOREY

BREVIORA

[The managing editor establishes this subdepartment because of the difficulty of procuring substantial critical reviews of all books, and the impossibility if they were found of printing them in our limited space. It is believed that brief but fair *comptes rendus* will prove more useful than a mere biographical notice. Contributions to this department should never exceed a page, and a paragraph is preferable.]

A Translation of the "Orpheus" of Angelo Politian and the "Aminta" of Torquato Tasso, with an Introductory Essay on the Pastoral. By LOUIS E. LORD. Oxford University Press, 1931. Pp. 182. \$3.00.

The critic will hardly know what to say about this book. The attractive format of the little volume predisposes one in its favor, and the contents make good reading. The inquisitorial posture in which the reviewer for *Classical Philology* is supposed to pounce upon the aberrations of all who make bold to "extend the bounds of knowledge" quickly relaxes into pleasurable appreciation of a piece of writing which, though done by a scholar, does not pretend to be a contribution to scholarship in the technical sense of that word, being, as it were, a testimonial of the author's love of the pastoral and its delightful associations.

The long sketch—not too long—of the history of the pastoral, Greek, Roman, and Italian, which serves as a fitting introduction to the *Orpheus* of Politian and the *Aminta* of Tasso, here rendered into English by the author, adds nothing to our knowledge—except a welcome grace and charm.

As to the faithfulness of Professor Lord's translations from the Italian, this reviewer does not feel himself competent to judge. The clear and simple dignity of his English is, however, manifest to anyone of literary taste.

One closes the book with a feeling of regret that Professor Lord's intention "years ago" of writing an exhaustive history of the pastoral was ever given up. A thorough cultivation of that field by such a lover of it would have been fruitful.

GEORGE NORLIN

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Index Aristophaneus. By O. J. TODD. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. 275. \$5.00.

The friends of John Williams White will be grateful for the piety that has rescued from the corner of the Harvard Library where it long *latebat abiectum* this portion at least of the *opera interrupta* preparatory to that definitive edition of Aristophanes which he did not live to complete. This is said with no intention of minimizing the scholarly and self-sacrificing industry required to prepare for publication the unfinished manuscript *turbatum mendis deforme mancum*. The work is Dr. Todd's, but the dedication will help to keep the name of White alive.

The compiler of an index indeed has a better chance of immortality than many a more pretentious author. Successive generations of scholars rise up and call him blessed, and his reputation does not wax and wane with theories that come and go.

On the publication of Dunbar's two-volume *Concordance* in 1883 Professor Geddes predicted that it would not be superseded for two hundred years. Mr. Todd's *Index* may for many purposes conveniently take its place, but does not compete with or supersede a *Concordance* that gives the full line for every word. Its use is that it is much briefer, cheaper, refers to a more modern text (the Oxford), and includes apparently complete lists of all the particles, which in Dunbar are perfunctorily represented by one or two examples. Every properly equipped classical library will henceforth need both. But both, like all mechanical aids that hold the eel of science by the tail, have to be used with caution. Dunbar gives no hint that some manuscripts and editors read *λάσκων* in *Eq.* 1018, and the student would not learn from Todd that some read *χάσχων*. I of course am not now in a position to deal critically with Mr. Todd's work, but I have tested it of purpose and incidentally on quite a number of words and found it accurate. Mr. Todd and the Harvard Press are to be congratulated and thanked for the service that they have rendered to scholarship.

PAUL SHOREY

The Rhetoric of Aristotle. Translated by LANE COOPER, PH.D. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1932. \$3.00.

Professor Lane Cooper continues his work as mediator between the department of English and the classics by adding yet another to the three recent translations of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. His aim is to provide a text that will be intelligible and serviceable to the Greekless undergraduate and the English reader generally. To that end he expands or comments on sentences whose terseness or abstractness might present difficulties, and inserts in the text in square brackets all the explanations which he deems needful. I leave it to his readers to decide whether that is the most convenient place for a footnote.

The book as a work of popularization hardly calls for criticism in *Classical Philology*. The explanations are sound as far as they go. But Professor Cooper does not, for example, attempt to deal critically with the different meanings of *topos*, and his account of the enthymeme is very vague though perhaps sufficient for his purpose. His Preface calls attention to the interpretation of two passages which he thinks should interest scholars: 1411 *a* 18-20 and 1417 *b* 16-20. In the first passage he apparently takes as a novelty the merely verbal difference between his translation, "My daughter's marriage bonds are overdue," and other renderings that really intend the same meaning. In the second passage his rendering of *δαράττειν* is practically identical with Jebb's, but he translates *ὑποχρεῖται* "avouch the truth of her story."

PAUL SHOREY

Vergil's Primitive Italy. By CATHARINE SAUNDERS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1930. Pp. viii+226. \$3.00.

These studies offer neither delicacies for Vergilian sentimentalists nor conventional patter for traditionalists. The chapter on "The Greeks in Vergil's Primitive Italy" brings to light a mass of material from archaeological reports and literary sources that makes a genuine demand upon the reader's judgment, and is calculated to disturb the complacency of those who are loath to believe that anything new can be added to our knowledge of the author. Professor Saunders is herself too prudent to apply salesmanship to scholarship; for the most part her evidence is permitted to speak for itself—a reticence as admirable as it is wise. The truth is that the reader discovers himself becoming more open-minded as he proceeds. The other topics discussed are "The City of Latinus," "The Catalogue of *Aeneid* x," "The Volscians," "Human Sacrifice," "Cremation and Inhumation," "Warfare and Arms," and "The Relation of *Aeneid* iii to the Rest of the Poem." Any of these might start a controversy but the author is not provocative. The net conclusion drawn from the volume is this—that it is worth while to investigate any hint of Vergil concerning the antiquities of Italy, and that the accumulated data justify us in believing him to have written more often with knowledge than with poetic license. I permit myself one suggestion. The death of Marcellus in 23 B.C. must have forced Vergil to make room for his *laudatio* in Book vi. This was perhaps done by removing the catalogue promised in iii. 458-60 to the end of Book vii and inserting in its place the speech of Anchises (vi. 752-892). This assumption easily explains an inconsistency, the two passages being of equal length. As a parting word it may be added that among the bimillennial studies this work deserves very special mention. It starts something new and worth while.

NORMAN W. DEWITT

VICTORIA COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Makers of Europe, Being the James Henry Morgan Lectures in Dickinson College for 1930. By ROBERT SEYMOUR CONWAY. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931. Pp. 89. \$1.25.

This slender volume by our distinguished English guest contains four chapters, entitled "Caesar the Destroyer," "The Originality of Cicero," "Horace's Farm and Its Political Fruit," and "Poetry and Government: A Study of the Power of Vergil." It would be an injustice to treat them as learned disquisitions. They are too brief and personal to invite criticism. They are better classified as humanistic homilies, and their aim is to be impressive rather than convincing. Hence the portentous title *Makers of Europe*. Hence the statement (p. 17) that Caesar was "a solemn creature and of real humour he seems to have been destitute." Hence such an exaggeration as the following (p. 68), "Those great writers [Vergil, Horace, and Livy] were the source and centre of what was good in the new Empire." He identifies Antony with Cacus (p. 74). He descends to the use of a cheap witticism (p. 82) and concludes the same paragraph with an apt and memorable quotation. He scolds those who disagree with him (p. 68).

Professor Conway is more of an adept with the flashlight than with the searchlight. It is this fact combined with his engaging personality that makes his lectures interesting. He possesses the gift of thinking freshly even when, as in this volume, the matter is not new. His visits to America are always memorable.

NORMAN W. DE WITT

VICTORIA COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Pastoralbrevens Äkthet. Av GÖSTA THÖRNELL. "Svenskt Arkiv för Humanistika Avhandlingar," No. III. Gothenburg: Eranos Förlag, 1931. Pp. 239. Kr. 8.

The question of the genuineness of the so-called Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul is the subject of this imposing monograph. The author first examines the various reasons adduced against their authenticity, and concludes that not one is valid. Such differences as actually exist between these and the other Pauline epistles are all to be explained otherwise. Some are incidental to the difference in the circumstances attending their composition; others are characteristic of the last period of the apostle's life, and are common to his other epistles of the same period; and still others are due to his habit of favoring different forms of expression at different times. Mr. Thörnell then establishes certain stylistic characteristics on the basis of the other epistles, reapplies them to those under discussion, and arrives at the conclusion that there is no justifiable basis even for the assumption that any one of the pastoral epistles

was interpolated. The work concludes with an extensive commentary on the passages of the pastoral epistles which are important from his point of view.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

WALTER PETERSEN

Textkritiska Studier till Arnobius. Av GERHARD WIMAN. "Svenskt Arkiv för Humanistika Avhandlingar," No. IV. Gothenburg: Eranos Förlag, 1931. Pp. vi+69. Kr. 4.

The author calls attention to the fact that the most recent edition of Arnobius, that of Reifferscheid, is now sixty six years old, and that there is an urgent need for a new text. For this purpose, however, little can be gained by renewed collation of the single manuscript on which it is based, for P is very carefully written, but copied from a corrupt archetype. Improvement in the text must therefore be conjectural, and it is by contributing to the conjectural criticism of Arnobius that Mr. Wiman aims to help in arriving at a better text. He carefully reviews a large number of passages where P is suspected, and if necessary suggests emendations which are based on sounder principles or which are not so far from the manuscript reading. Thus in I. 23 for P's *appellat errores*, corrected from *apella terrores*, for which Ursinus suggested *appellat et heroas*, he adopts the easier correction *appellat erroneas* from Stewechius.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

WALTER PETERSEN

Latin Words of Common English. By EDWIN LEE JOHNSON. D. C. Heath & Co., 1931. Pp. 327. \$2.00.

This little book hardly falls within the jurisdiction of *Classical Philology* as a journal of research. But it may be mentioned and commended as a sound piece of work and a valuable ally in the struggle to preserve classical studies in America. It offers no more than the ideal student of Latin ought to know, but considerably more than the average high-school student will in fact learn. In the hands of a judicious teacher it will be an invaluable enrichment of the Latin course from the first year of the high school to the second or third year of the college. It presents a history of the adoption of Latin words or derivatives into the English language from Roman and Celtic Britain to the Renaissance and after, studies of the forms and meanings of Latin words in English, of word-formation in Latin, of French-English forms of Latin derivatives, of changes of form and meaning, of coined words and hybrids, of derivatives names, personal, geographical, commercial, etc., and of cognate words. There are useful tables of familiar Latin quotations, mottoes of states and of colleges, and Latin titles in literature, art, and music. There are added a sufficient Bibliography, a General Index, and a full Index of Words.

PAUL SHOREY

The Homeric Scholia. By T. W. ALLEN. Pp. 31. From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Volume XVII. London: Humphrey Milford Amen House, 1931.

The paper is an attempt to determine the period in which the Scholia took "their present, that is to say marginal, form." Search for traces of the Scholia is made in Orion, Stephanus of Byzantium, Choeroboscus, the *Eclogae*, *Etymologicum Magnum*, *Etymologicum Gudianum*, Zonaras, Eustathius. The conclusion drawn is that the desired date was "not before Choeroboscus, and perhaps during his period." The paper concerns the history of Byzantine education more closely than it does the criticism of Homer.

G. M. B.

